

JSAS

VOLUME 16

(2007)

**JOURNAL
OF THE
SOCIETY FOR
ARMENIAN STUDIES**



THE PROBLEM OF IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROTO-ARMENIANS: A CRITICAL REVIEW

Armen Petrosyan

The Problem and the Sources

The essential aspect of Armenian ethnogenesis is the problem of the identification of the linguistic ancestors of the Armenians.¹ The present work examines the problem of the earliest possible revelation and localization of the speakers of ancient versions of Armenian—the Proto-Armenians or Earliest Armenians²—with some reflections on how this people was formed and later developed.

This is, obviously, a linguistic problem and can be solved through linguistic examination. For the identification and localization of the bearers of early Armenian dialects we have nothing but the data of historical linguistics on the history of Armenian and the evidence of early written languages. Especially important is the data of onomastics of the Armenian Highland—names of tribes, places, persons and deities—attested in the early written languages (e.g. Assyrian, Hittite, Urartian, Hieroglyphic Luwian). We must examine those names and, if possible, identify the Proto-Armenian ones. Nevertheless, unequivocal etymological solutions are not always possible. We need also philological, historical, archeological, and ethnological analyses and arguments.

There are two types of information concerning the formation and early history of ancient peoples: historical and traditional, preserved in foreign and native sources. The researcher of Armenian prehistory, in this sense, is in a relatively favorable situation, as starting from early Mesopotamian sources until the first Greek authors there is historical evidence on the Armenian Highland and the adjacent regions. The traditional sources are the Armenian, Greek, Jewish, Georgian, and Arab legends on the genesis and primeval history of the Armenians.

Legends of Armenian Origins

The Armenian sources are of a mythological nature. The legends of the Armenian genesis (ethnogenic myth) have reached us in the book of the “father of Armenian history” Movsēs Xorenac‘i (Khorenats‘i) and the brief account of the origin of Armenia by Anonym, attributed to the seventh-century writer Sebēos, which present

¹ In his works on the Armenian ethnogenesis and prehistory I.M. Diakonoff distinguishes three aspects of the peoples' succession: biological, cultural and linguistic. Genocides are not characteristic to ancient history and the migrations and movements of different tribes have not caused substantial changes in the anthropological average features of the local inhabitants of the Armenian Highland, where, therefore, the local ancient type primarily maintains. Throughout different historical periods the cultural succession of the Armenian Highland is also explicit, i.e. the Armenians are the biological and cultural successors of the early inhabitants of the Armenian Highland (Diakonoff 1968: 7-9; Diakonoff 1983: 12 ff.; Diakonoff 1983a: 149; Diakonoff 1984: 1-3). Hence, the major question that remains disputable is the identification of the Armenians' linguistic ancestors.

² G. Djahukian (1987: 25) has suggested the following chronological terms for the pre-written history of Armenian: 1) Proto-Armenian (30th-12th centuries B.C.), 2) Earliest Armenian (12th century B.C.-4th century A.D.). Here, for the sake of simplicity, the term Proto-Armenian is used for the times preceding the fall of Urartu (the end of the 7th century B.C.).

reinterpreted Armenian oral tradition coordinated with the Bible and Greek literary sources (Xorenac'i 1.10-16; Anonym). According to the legends, the first ancestor of the Armenians was Hayk, son of T'orgom, descendant of Noah's son Japhet. After the construction of the tower of Babel he refused to obey the Babylonian tyrant Bel (identified with the Biblical Nimrod) and with his large patriarchal family, consisting of three hundred men, came and settles in Armenia, in the district Hark' to the northwest of Lake Van. Bel attacked Hayk with his huge army but was killed in the battle. Hayk's eldest son Aramaneak moved to the Ayrarat province, in the Ararat valley (to the north of Mt. Ararat), which remained the domain of the following generations of the Haykids. Aramaneak's son Aramayis built the first capital Armawir (60 km. [37.2 miles] to the west of Erevan). Aramayis' grandson Gelam became the eponym of the Lake and Mountains of Gelam (modern Lake Sevan and the mountain range to the west of it). Gelam's grandson Aram, the most warlike character of the ethnogonic myth, through many battles enlarged Armenia's borders in all directions. Aram's son Ara the Handsome was killed in the battle against the Assyrian queen Šamiram (Semiramis), and the Armenians fell under the rule of the Assyrians. Thus the "sacred" mythical era of the forefathers of Armenia ends and the "history" begins.

The Armenian ethnonym *Hay* is derived from the name of Hayk. According to Xorenac'i, the foreigners start calling Hayk's land Armenia and similar names after Aram, while Anonym emphasizes the ethnogonic role of Hayk's son Aramaneak/Aramenak/ Armenak, from which we can conclude that he also was considered the eponym of the ethnonym *Armen* (G. Sargsyan 1998: 123). The central province of Armenia Ayrarat and its core Ararat plain are both considered to be named after Ara the Handsome (Field of Ara).

According to a Greek legend ascribed to two captains of Alexander the Great, Cyrsilus the Pharsalian and Medius the Larisaean, the Armenians' forefather was Armenos, one of the participants of the Argonauts' journey. He came from the city Armenion in Thessaly to the north of Greece (in one version: from Rhodes). His companions settled first in Akilisene, i.e. the Ekeleac' district in the upper flows of the Euphrates (the city of Erzinka, Turk. Erzincan and its surroundings) (Strabo 11.4.8; 11.14.12; Justin 42.2.3, etc. See Adontz 1946: 322 ff.).

In Flavius Josephus, the Armenians descend from Aramos' son Oulos (*Antiquitates Judaicae* 1.6.4), who corresponds to the Biblical Hul, son of Aram, eponym of the Aramaeans (Petrosyan 1997: 160; Petrosyan 2002: 79, 164). The myth of the first Haykids is closely connected to the Georgian ethnogonic legend attested by Leonti Mroveli (11th century). Here the ancestor of the Armenians Haos (= Hayk), slayer of Nimrod, is represented as the eldest brother and lord of the eponymous forefathers of the Georgians and several other Caucasian tribes (Mroveli 1979: 21 ff.; Melikishvili 1989, 251-260; Petrosyan 1997, 70-72). This seems to be a variation on the Armenian ethnogonic theme. According to the Arab authors Yakut and Dimashki (11th-12th centuries A.D.) Armenia's founder was Armini, a descendant of Noah's son Japhet (Ter-Ghevondyan 1971).

The Historical Aspect of the Ethnogonic Legends

The most important of these are the Armenian legends as they reflect the way in which the ancient Armenians have imagined the beginning of their existence. They represent the epicized version of the creation myth on the beginning of the universe

and time (countries, mountains, rivers, months and hours were named after Hayk and the first Haykids, while naming in mythology is equivalent to creation itself). The figures of Hayk and the following ethnogonic patriarchs originate from ancient divine figures. The characters and names of their opponents are also mythical: e.g. Hayk's adversary Bel (i.e. Akkad. Bēl, Semitic *b' l* "lord"), the ruler of Babylon, should be identified as the great Babylonian god Bēl-Marduk. The pivotal characters of the legends—Hayk, Aram and Ara the Handsome—constitute an Indo-European "trifunctional" triad, associated, respectively, with the first (sovereign), the second (military) and the third (fertility) functions of Indo-European mythology. The characters of the Armenian forefathers' opponents (Bel, Baršamin, Šamiram) also form an identical trifunctional system. Thus, this is a typical Indo-European myth (Ahyan 1981; Dumézil 1994: 133 ff.; Petrosyan 1997; Petrosyan 2002).

Myth is outside of real space and time. This holds true especially for the creation myths, which are used to explicate the formation of space and time. However, the epicized myth acquires spatial and temporal characteristics. The geography of the first forefathers' settlements and their movements in Armenia cannot be greatly affected by mythological or religious factors. This concerns Hayk's settling in Hark', and his first son Aramaneak's subsequent moving to Ayrarat (Ararat plain). This is where the Armenian universe and history concentrate after Hayk.

We can call Hayk's domain Hark' "Primary Armenia." The real Armenia begins with Aramaneak's settling in Ayrarat. The Armenian cosmogony, for the most part, occurs in Ayrarat. The next important stage is the enlargement of the borders of Armenia by Aram, whose native abode was also Ayrarat.

Greek Authors on the Armenian Origins

According to Herodotus (7.73), the Armenians were "Phrygian immigrants" (Φρυγῶν ἀποικολ), who were armed as the Phrygians as well, while according to a passage from Eudoxus of Knidus (5th century B.C., attested by Stephanus of Byzantium in the 12th century A.D.), the Armenian language resembled Phrygian (see e.g. Manandyan 1944: 12-15; Adontz 1946: 322 ff.; Piotrovskii 1959: 122-123; Diakonoff 1984: 110, 189-190, n. 40; Greppin 1984; Matiossian 1991; Barseghyan 1996: 4-9).

The Phrygians, most probably, were a Balkanic tribe which had migrated to Asia Minor and established their kingdom in the 8th-7th centuries B.C. (centuries after the fall of the Hittite empire). This is consonant, but not identical, with the legend of Armenos, according to which the Armenians' ancestor comes from Thessaly. On the other side, mainly on the basis of historical sources, a theory that the Phrygians originated in Asia Minor was in use (see e.g. Petrova 1998; Brixhe 2004: 777).

It is obvious that ancient Greek authors could not determine the genetic and linguistic affinity between the tribes and languages. Strabo, who was a native of Asia Minor and well-informed on the Armenians and other peoples of the region, wrote that the Armenians, Syrians and Arabs were closely connected by their languages and physical and cultural characteristics (Strabo 1.2.34; 16.4.27). This is unacceptable: Aramaean and Arabic are Semitic languages. Notably, the fact that Armenian is an independent Indo-European language was established only in 1875 by H. Hübschmann. Until then linguists had classified it as an Iranian language.

It was believed that among the Indo-European languages Armenian had a close connection with Greek and certain Paleo-Balkan languages, including Phrygian (Djahukian 1970; Djahukian 1987: 86-204, 296-311). The information concerning Phrygian is scant, but, however, it is unquestionably most closely linked with Greek. The contemporary supporters of the Proto-Armenians' Balkanic origin represent their thesis in certain correspondence with contemporary scientific ideas. Thus, according to Igor Diakonoff, Armenian is not a Phrygian dialect, but a separate language of the Thracio-Phrygian group. If considered literally, Herodotus' thesis, presenting Armenians as Phrygian immigrants, is wrong. However, if considered as a statement that the Armenians have come from the neighboring western areas of the Armenian Highland, which had been previously populated by the Hittites and afterwards by the Phrygians, it can be accepted (Diakonoff 1968: 204-209; Diakonoff 1983a: 155, n. 29, 173-174; Diakonoff 1984: 109-112). It should be also noted that the notion of Armeno-Greek close connections has been denied (Clackson 1994; with Thracian and Albanian some arguments can be adduced: Kortlandt 2003: 74, 86, 140, 152-153), and the thesis of a close Armeno-Phrygian relationship (Diakonoff 1976; Nerosznak 1976; Diakonoff and Nerosznak 1985), as well as the idea of Thracio-Phrygian unity is dismissed in contemporary studies (see e.g. Brixhe 2004: 780).

The Problem of Urartu

Many questions of Armenian ethnogenesis and prehistory are directly associated with Urartu, the first kingdom to unite the Armenian Highland under one crown (the 9th-7th centuries B.C.). The language of the Urartian inscriptions is not Armenian. This is the main reason that during the 19th-20th centuries the thesis of the late immigration of the Proto-Armenians to the Armenian Highland was formulated.

Urartu is the Assyrian appellation of the state. In Urartian texts their country, or rather, the core of their country, the Van area, is called *Biaînili*, though we can only conjecture what they called themselves (for a hypothesis on the Urartian self-designation see Diakonoff 1992; Petrosyan 2002: 180). The original versions of this name are considered to be *Uruatri/u* and *Uratri* (attested to, respectively, in the 13th and 10th centuries B.C.). *Uruatri/u* / *Uratri* was located in the extreme south of the Armenian Highland, the area of the present-day state boundary between Iraq and Turkey (Melikishvili 1954: 150 ff; Piotrovskii 1959: 43-46; Arutyunyan 1970: 17). *Ardini* and *Qumenu*, the worship centers of the two first gods of the supreme triad of the Urartian pantheon, *Haldi* and *Teišeba*, were also located there. The center of the third great god *Šiwini* was the city of Van (Urart. *Tušpa*) (see e.g. Diakonoff 1981: 82). It may be assumed that *Šiwini* was the great god of the natives of the Van region who were overcome by conquerors from the south. Thus, the homeland of the Urartian language and of the ruling dynasty of Urartu was situated in a southern area which was not technically part of Urartu (Melikishvili 1954: 368; Diakonoff 1983a: 174-175, n. 78; Diakonoff 1984: 77, 167-168, n. 155; Salvini 1995: 184; Zimansky 2001: 24; Petrosyan 2006: 48-50).

Urartian monuments and culture, including the inscriptions, were created mostly by the state authorities and not by a large stratum of the population. The kings of *Tušpa-Van* conquered and maintained dominion over the regions of the Armenian Highland by force. Cities and fortresses were established in the conquered lands; they were populated by people loyal to the empire, though not ethnically homogeneous,

and sometimes brought from other regions. The monuments of "Urartian" culture, from pottery to temples, are concentrated in these centers. The rest of the population was not under direct Urartian control, continuing their old culture and lifestyle, essentially different from the "Urartian" one, and often had a hostile attitude towards the empire. P. Zimansky's latest thorough research shows that the creators of the Urartian state and state attributes, probably, were very few in number. An Urartian speaking community formed the core of the empire, while the main population of the country consisted of other elements (Zimansky 1995; see also Zimansky 2001; Zimansky and Stone 2003).

Urartu was an empire. Such a widespread mountainous country, before being united as a one state, could not have been linguistically homogeneous. Many tribes and tribal groups are mentioned in the Urartian records, which show that the country was multilingual. This is also evident from the examination of the onomastics of Urartu (the southwestern regions of the Highland were inhabited by the Hurrians and Luwians; there are also apparent Armenian, Thracian, and Iranian names in the Urartian onomastics.³

The Problem of the Indo-European Homeland

In the infancy of Indo-European linguistics the Indo-European homeland was localized on the slopes of the biblical mountain Ararat in Armenia (Mallory 1989: 10), and afterwards, based on different argumentations, in almost all the territory throughout which the Indo-European languages spread, from India and Middle Asia to Western Europe, including Asia Minor. However, the Armenian Highland and the neighboring territories have never been among the popular localizations. At the beginning of the 1970s Tamaz Gamkrelidze and Viacheslav Ivanov suggested a hypothesis according to which the Indo-Europeans originated from the neighboring areas of the Armenian Highland, while R. Renfrew suggested another theory stating that the Indo-Europeans originated from South-Central Asia Minor. These hypotheses were presented later in monographs (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984; Renfrew 1987). Gevorg Djahukian also was inclined to localize the Indo-European homeland somewhere in Asia Anterior (Djahukian 1987: 73-76; Djahukian 1992a: 22-26; cf. Djahukian 1967, 38-39). According to J. Mallory, there are four localizations that are most commonly proposed now: 1) Baltic-Pontic; 2) Anatolian; 3) Central European-Balkan; and 4) Pontic-Caspian (Mallory 1989; Mallory and Adams 1997: 290-299). Thus, the Armenian Highland is not included in the common localizations, though the listed second and fourth regions can be characterized as "near to Armenia" (for such localizations see also Drews 2001). However, all these localizations are highly hypothetical. It is evident that modern science still cannot localize the Indo-European homeland.

The problem of ethnogenesis is oversimplified when it is directly associated with the Indo-European homeland. Moreover, the formulation of any hypothesis on the basis of a certain localization of the Indo-European homeland can devalue it. The period of the homeland frequently dates from earlier than the 4th millennium B.C. The independent development of the Armenian language probably began as early as the beginning of the 3rd millennium B.C. (Djahukian 1987: 25). Any localization far

³ For the Armenian names see below; for the Indo-Iranian and Thracian names: Djahukian 1987: 434-435; for the Hurrian names: Gelb 1944: 82-83; for the Luwian names: below, n. 11.

from Armenia does not theoretically rule out the possibility that the Armenians' linguistic ancestors were in the Armenian Highland in the 2nd millennium B.C. or even earlier. On the other hand, any localization near Armenia theoretically does not rule out the possibility of the roaming of the Proto-Armenians elsewhere and coming to Armenia later.

The Armenian Ethnonyms

The scientific theories of the identification of the Proto-Armenians and, respectively, the Armenian ethnogenesis, can be differentiated according to the viewpoints identifying the Armenian ethnonyms with the ethno-toponyms attested in ancient sources. On the other hand, essential is not only the historically attested prototype of the ethnonym, but also its genesis and etymology. If the ethnonym is of Armenian origin, then its first mention will indicate the existence of the community speaking in (Proto-) Armenian, in a given epoch and area, while if it is of non-Armenian origin, i.e. a borrowing, then the problem becomes complicated. The ethnonym could have been borrowed before or after its first attestation, i.e. it would be impossible to identify the Armenian speaking community based solely on this data.

Ethnonyms, like proper names, are hard to etymologize. We need more light on the subject, additional evidence, which can reveal their original meanings (otherwise the etymologies can only be speculative). It is the ethnogonic myth that provides us with an exceptional opportunity to interpret them. In the given insufficiency of other data the characteristics of the mythological eponymous forefathers can help reveal the etymologies of their names and respective ethnonyms.

The etymology of Hayk's name and the related ethnonym *Hay* is essential for our problem. It was believed, for a long time, that it goes back to the Indo-European **poti-* "master, lord, master of the house, husband." Later this was disputed (see e.g. Djahukian 1987: 284, with bibliography). However, our analysis shows its validity. In several dialects the elderly women mention their husbands in their absence as *mer hayə* "our hay," i.e. "husband, chief of our family," cf. synonymous *glxavor* "chief, head," *glxater* "lord of (my) head" (H. Khach'atryan 2003: 19). This word, very plausibly, can be etymologized from **poti-*.

Hayk is the head of a patriarchal family consisting of three hundred men and their own families. Thus, Hayk's name can also be associated with **poti-*, with the diminutive/ venerable suffix *-ik* peculiar to the appellations of the elders and mythological names: *Hay-ik* > *Hayk*, cf. *hayr/ hayrik* "father," *pap/ papik* "grandfather," theonymic *Astlik* "Venus," lit. "Little star," and Aramaneak (son of Hayk), with an analogical suffix *-ak*. It is characteristic that the second part of Hayk's constant epithet *nahapet* "patriarch" presents the Iranian reflex of the Indo-European **pot-*, while the name of Hayk's adversary Bel also means "lord, master," used as an independent theonym as well (Petrosyan 1986; Petrosyan 2002: 58, 61, 161).

In Armenian tradition, the constellation Orion was named after Hayk (Alishan 1895: 119). Hayk kills his adversary Bel with an *erek't'ewean* "three-winged, triple-fleshed" arrow (Xorenac'i 1.11). In this context the best Indo-European parallel of Hayk is the Indic god Rudra, the father and leader of the Rudras called by his name (cf. the correlation of the name of Hayk with his descendants and followers *Hays* "Armenians"). In India, the constellation Orion is personified by the god Prajāpati

who was transfixed by the three-jointed arrow (*iṣus trikāṇḍa*, the belt stars of Orion) shot by Rudra (Allen 1963: 309-310; Fontenrose 1981: 239-240; Tjorin and Erman 1985: 16-18, 276-277). Significantly, the second element of the characteristic epithets of Rudra (*ganapati*, *vrāṭapati*, *bhūṭapati*, *paśupati*, *grhapati*, *sthapati*, *sabhapati*), as well as the name of Prajāpati, are derived from **poti-* (Petrosyan 2002: 55; Petrosyan 2003: 193).⁴

The plural genetic *Hayoc* 'lets us assume that before the regular disappearance of the last vowel in Armenian in the first centuries A.D. it sounded **Hayo*. This form could originate from **poti-*, suffixed with the Indo-European suffix **(i)yo-* either in ancient times or in a relatively later period: **poti-* > **Hay(i)-*, suffixed with **(i)yo-*: **Hayo-*. Although, it is possible also that the stem in *-o* is a late formation (Djahukian 1961: 388), developed, for example, on the analogy of similar ethno-toponyms (*Tayk'-Tayoc*, **Vayk'-Vayoc*).

Several etymologies have been suggested for the ethnonym *Armen*. In historical context it is frequently considered as a derivative of the ethno-toponym *Arme* attested in Urartian sources (Piotrovskii 1959: 124; Diakonoff 1984: 199, n. 115; Djahukian 1987: 285-288, with bibliography). In a posthumously published article Diakonoff suggests a new hypothetical etymology from Gk. *ἀρμενος* "fit, favorable," i.e. "non-hostile," as opposed to other peoples of Asia Minor, who were hostile to the Greeks (Diakonoff 2005: 277). This shows that the author was unsure of his previous etymology, which became very popular due to his works.

In Xorenac'i, the ethnonym *Armen* is eponymized by the patriarch Aram. He kills the Syrian hero Baršam, i.e. the epic version of the god Baršamin (i.e. the Syrian *Ba'al Šamin* "Lord of Heaven"). The latter was called *spitakap'ar* "of white glory" (Agat'angelos 784) and his idol was "embelished with ivory, crystal and silver" (Xorenac'i 2.14). In this context, Aram is best comparable with the Indic Rāma (Indo-European **rēmo-* "dark, black"). In epic India, the first Rāma—Parasurāma "Rāma-with-the-axe"—defeats Arjuna Kārtavīrya, whose name is derived from the **Harg'* "bright, white" (*Mahābhārata* 3.115-116; the story is also told in the *Purāṇas*). Notably, the name of Mt. Argaeus, where Aram defeats another adversary, is derived from the Hittite version of **Harg'* (Laroche 1985: 88-89). These myths can be considered in the context of the theme of black and white or dark and light, which appears in myths and epics elsewhere. Moreover, Aram would represent the epicized version of the black thunder god who fights with his white adversary (Petrosyan 1997; Petrosyan 2002: 43 ff.; Petrosyan 2003: 194 ff.). His name can be regarded as the regular reflex of **rHmo-* (**rēmo-* and **rōmo-* would yield **Arim* and **Arum*, respectively, and *Arm-* in derivatives and compounds). The name of Aramaneak/ Aramenak, who figures as the eponym of the ethnonym *Armen* in Anonym, seems to represent a conflation (see below, n. 20).

Proceeding from the Armenian ethnonyms *Hay* and *Armen* an opinion has been advanced that two ethnic units played an essential role in the Armenian ethnogenesis:

⁴ For various considerations on the etymology of the ethnonym *Hay* see Djahukian 1961: 386 ff.; Djahukian 1987: 284. In his later works Djahukian accepted this etymology (Djahukian 1988a (1): 68; Djahukian 1990: 26; Djahukian 1992a: 50; Djahukian 1992b: 18), which makes unnecessary its special linguistic argumentation in the present article. Some folklore data provide possibility for an alternative etymological solution of Hayk's name, cf. IE **Hā(s)-* "burn," which in later times (after the **p-* > *h-* and **-t-* > *-y-* changes) could have been confounded with *hay* < **poti-*, see Petrosyan 2002: 59-61.

the Hays and the Armens (Patkanov 1881: 88-90). This opinion has been repeated by many scholars, who have attributed different origins to these tribes (e.g. the first has been considered a local, non-Indo-European tribe, while a Balkanic origin has been attributed to the second). This idea is only hypothetical.

The Proto-Armenians in the Armenian Highland

Many scholars have written about the linguistic traces of the Armenian ethnic element in Ancient Near East. The most significant are Djahukian's works, where he examines the borrowings of the Armenian language from ancient cuneiform languages and shows that it is possible for some cuneiform languages to have borrowings from Proto-Armenian and that numerous ancient names of the Armenian Highland and adjacent regions can be etymologized in Armenian. Furthermore, the arguments adduced by Diakonoff are important, as he, more than any other scholar, was familiar with the ancient history, cultures and languages of the region (Djahukian 1986; Djahukian 1987: 312-321, 417-474; Djahukian 1988: 148-161, Djahukian 1988a; Djahukian 1992; Djahukian 1992a: 34-38, 53-59; Diakonoff 1967: 135; Diakonoff 1985: 602-603; Diakonoff 1992).

Even the most credible reciprocal borrowings of Armenian and cuneiform languages cannot localize Proto-Armenians more precisely than "not far from the speakers of those languages." In order to localize them in the Armenian Highland first of all we need to examine the onomastics of the Highland. Until the first millennium B.C., our data are poor and concern only the southern and western regions. It is the Urartian sources that mention a large number of proper names throughout the Highland (names of men, deities, tribes, cities, lands, rivers, mountains). Unlike, for example, the Hayasian names, a significant number of the Urartian place names are localized fairly accurately, and moreover, many of them present early versions of the well known Armenian toponyms.

The following question is essential: were there speakers of Proto-Armenian in the Armenian Highland in the pre-Urartian period (i.e., before the mid-9th century B.C.) or did they appear here during the existence or after the fall of Urartu? If we show that there is at least one borrowing in Urartian from Armenian and that some place and personal names mentioned in the Urartian sources have Armenian origin, then we can say that Earliest Armenian was spoken along with Urartian in the Armenian Highland.

Below are presented a few indicative examples from the dozens adduced by various authors.

The Armenian conjunction *ew* "and" originates from the Indo-European **epi-* (> **ewi* > *ew*). The native origin of the conjunction is beyond all doubt. It is borrowed in Urartian, where it appears as *eue*, *e'a* (to read: *ewa*), *eia*, *eai* (the two last forms are the results of a development peculiar to Urartian). They are known from the first Urartian records of the last quarter of the 9th century B.C. (Arutyunyan 2001: 442). Hence, Urartian was in contact with Armenian prior to this time. In order to show that this conjunction is borrowed from Armenian, Diakonoff notes that it is not known in earlier attested Hurrian and other North-Eastern Caucasian languages (which are considered to be related to Hurro-Urartian). Hurrian is an ergative language and does not use non-affixed conjunctions. There exists a good analogy: another ancient ergative language, Old Sumerian, does not have non-affixed

conjunctions, but Neo-Sumerian has acquired a new conjunction *u* "and" from Akkadian with which it co-existed (Diakonoff 1992: 52-53).

The river name *Aršania*, attested in an Assyrian source in the mid-9th century B.C., corresponds to Arm. *Aracani* < **Arcaniyā*, Gk. Ἀρσανίας (Turk. *Murat-su*, Arutyunyan 1985: 44). Notably, there was a homonymic city to the southwest of Lake Van. This name has an apparent Armenian etymology: cf. Indo-European **Harg*- "bright, white," with the reflection *arc*- peculiar to Armenian (e.g. *arcat* "silver"), and the suffix *-ani* < *-*a-niyā* (for the Indo-European hydronyms from **Harg*- see e.g. Krahe 1962: 8, n. 2, 31-32).

The Upper (Western) Euphrates in different languages and in different periods has been called: Hitt. *Mala*, Urart. *Melia(ini)*, Gk. Μέλας (Arutyunyan 2001: 514); cf. Indo-European **mel*- "black," with the suffix *-*iyā*, and the Turkish name of the river: *Kara-su* "Black water." Significantly, the main tributary of Aracani Meḡraḡet has similar appellations: its ancient name is *Meḡ* (cf. **mel*- "black"), while currently it is called *Kara-su* (Eremyan 1963: 70). Evidently, these names reflect certain mythological and cosmological ideas on the black and white contrast, localized along the river *Aršania* (Petrosyan 2002: 186).

The "royal city" of the first known Urartian king Aramu, *Aršašku(nu)* may be identified with the Armenian *Arčēš* (Turk. *Erciş*) to the north of Lake Van and etymologized from the Indo-European **Harg*'esk^(h)-o- (derivative of **Harg*- "bright, white") > **Arcesk*'o- > *Arčēšo*, Gen. *Arčišoy* (an almost precise rendering of *Arcesk*'o is Assy. *Aršašku*-). *Arčēš* was the denomination of the northern gulf of Lake Van as well as the whole lake itself (cf. also Gk. Ἀρση(ση)νη /Strabo, 11.14.8/, Arab. *Arjīš* "Lake Van"); a city to the north of the lake was called *Arcak* "small *Arc*" (later: *Arcke* = Turk. *Adilcevaz*); moreover, a small lake to the east of Lake Van is called *Arčīšak* > *Arčak* "small *Arčēš*," Turk. *Erçek*. Thus, this early Urartian capital could have been named (and once populated) by the Proto-Armenians (Petrosyan 2002: 71 ff., with bibliography).⁵

Aramu (var. Arame, Arama) coincides with the name of the second Armenian eponym Aram (**Aramo/ā*, with the regular disappearance of the final vowel in Armenian). As has been noted, this was the epithetal name of the "black" thunder god. In the ancient states of the region, theonyms were frequently used as anthroponyms, cf. Hitt. Telepinus, Arnuwandas, Luw. Tarhunzas, Yarris, Runtiyas, Assy. Ašur, Hur. Kumarpi, etc.

Tuarasiniei hubi "Tuarasian valley," attested in the second quarter of the 8th century B.C. (may correspond to *Tuarizu* of an Assyrian source of the mid-8th century B.C.), corresponds with the Armenian *Tuaracoy tap*, *Tuaracatap* "plain of *tuarac*," located to the north of the upper streams of the river *Aršania*, north from the district of Hark' (Arutyunyan 1985: 185-186). For the etymology of this name cf. Arm. *tuarac* "graze cattle, cowherd," *tuaracatap* "place for grazing bull-calves," consisting of the words *tuar* "bull-calf" and *aracil* "graze," from which the latter is doubtlessly native Armenian (Indo-European **treg*-); *tuar* is usually etymologized from the Indo-European **dēpHro*- (cf. also Semitic **taur*-, see Djahukian 1988: 154, n. 52).

⁵ For the localization of *Arsašku(nu)*, see Arutyunyan 1985: 34-35; for the Indo-European "white" cities: Petrosyan 2002: 71 ff.

Diūšini/ Tiūšini (*di* can also be read as *ti*, see Diakonoff 1958: 32): the name of a king, ruler of the federation of Etiuni, which encompassed the northern regions of the Armenian Highland. This name, attested in the middle of the 8th century B.C., is comparable to the Indo-European (especially Balkanic) anthroponymic pattern **deiwo-* “god” + **g'en-* “birth, kin,” cf. Gk. *Διογένης*, Thrac. *Διυζενι*, *Diuzenus*, also Gk. *Θιογενεις*, from *θεός* “god” (Gindin 1981: 42, 77). For the Armenian interpretation, cf. *tiw* “daytime” (< **deiwo-* “god,” “day”), or *dik'*, gen. pl. *diwc'* “gods” (**dhēs-*) and *cin* “birth, kin.”

In these names the presence of the sound /c/ is essential, as it represents the reflection of the Indo-European **g'* peculiar only to Armenian (this sound does not exist in other Indo-European languages). In Armeno-Urartian lexical and onomastical parallels Urart. *s* corresponds only to Arm. *c* (Diakonoff 1958: 36; Djahukian 1987: 430-431), which in the considered etymologies is indicative of the Armenian language.

These names may substantiate the presence of the Proto-Armenians in the Armenian Highland, particularly in the area of the upper streams of Aršana, north of Lake Van, the domain of the patriarch Hayk, as well as to the west and north of it before the formation of the Urartian Empire.⁶ Judging by the Proto-Armenian etymologies of Aramu and Aršašku(nu) one cannot rule out the possibility that Aramu was an Armenian ruler who fought against the Assyrians in the north of Lake Van and surroundings, i.e., in the area of Hayk's domain. After Aramu, the ruling dynasty of Urartu was changed and the new capital city Tušpa (Van) was established (see below, in the discussion of the Etiuni hypothesis).⁷ Toponyms, especially hydronyms, present the earliest strata of languages, and might have existed in pre-Urartian times, many centuries before their first attestations.

The Arimoi Hypothesis

The author of the first complex studies on the Armenian ethnogenesis is Josef Markwart, a pivotal part of whose work is the examination of the ethnonym *Armen* (previous authors have generally examined the linguistic aspect of the problem).

⁶ Following are some other examples of Armenian elements in the Urartian language and onomastics from Djahukian 1992 (the adduced Armenian words are considered Indo-European). Words: Urart. *abili-* “to add” = Arm. *awel-* “id,” Urart. *Arsibi* (the name of King Minua's horse) – Arm. *arcui* “eagle,” Urart. *z/sari* “garden” – Arm. *car* “tree,” Urart. *šuri* “edge, spearhead; weapon” – Arm. *sur* “sharp; sword,” Urart. *armuzzi* “family” – Arm. *arm(n)* “root, tribe, generation,” Urart. *arniše* “deed” – Arm. *arnem* “to do, make,” Urart. *aniarduni* “independent” – Arm. *anyar* “unrelated, separate,” Urart. *baūše* “speech; order, thing” – Arm. *ba-n* “word, speech; thing,” Urart. *zil(i)be/i* “breed, generation” – Arm. *c'el* “tribe”; theonyms: *Airaini* – Arm. *ayr* “cave” (**ayrayin*), *Aršibedini* – *arcui* “eagle,” *Sinuiardi* – *cin-o-* “birth, *clan” + *ardi* “order” (goddess of birth and tribe), *Turani* – *tur(k)* “giving, gift” (**Turan-* the god who gives, presents); hydronyms: *Alaini* (cf. also town names *Aliala*, *Alıştu*) – *al* “salt,” *Gugunaini* – *gog-o* “gulf, sinus,” *Uluruš* – *olor* “winding,” mount names: *Aršabia*, *Aršidu* (cf. also place names *Arsugu*, *Aluarsa*, *Balduarsa*, *Gizuarsu*) – **arc-* “white, bright,” *Karnišie* – *k'ar* “stone” (Pl. Acc. *k'arins*); other place-names: *Alburi* – *afbiwr* “spring, source,” *Meluiani* – *metu* “bee,” *Šarni* – *sarn* “ice, cold,” *Zirma* – *ferm* “warm,” *Dilizia* – *deľj* “yellow,” *Barzuriani*, *Barzaništun*, *Kulibarzini-barjr* “high.” For many of these and other etymologies coherent reasons could be adduced.

⁷ Alternatively, it has been hypothesized that Aramu the Urartian might have been a “condotier” of Aramaean ancestry, while Aršašku(nu) was localized in the basin of Lake Urmia (van Loon 1966: 7; Salvini 1987: 399 f.; Salvini 1995: 27 ff.). For the relation of the Aramaean and Armenian ethnonyms see Petrosyan 2002: 163 ff. According to Y. Grekhan (personal communication), Mt. Adduru, mentioned in the area of Aršašku, is to be identified with the Urartian Mt. Eiduru (modern Süphan). If so, Aršašku was situated not far from Süphan and thus should be identified with Arčēš.

According to him, the ethnonym *Armen* could have originated from the stem **arm-*, **arim-* or **arum-*, combined with the Urartian ending *-ini* (**arim-ini* and **arum-ini* both would yield **armini*). He compares this stem with the Greek plural *Arimoi* mentioned in the Iliad (2.781-783) as the place of the battle of Zeus and Typhon (ἐν Ἀρίμοις). Ancient and modern authors have localized the *Arimoi* in different places. One such place is Mt. Argaeus to the west of the Armenian Highland in Cappadocia, the highest mountain of Asia Minor, and once active volcano. Markwart considered the *Arimoi* as the ancestors of the Armenians, who had moved to Asia Minor from the Balkans and settled down in the region of Mt. Argaeus, and later moved to Armenia. In Xorenac'i, the patriarch Aram defeats his third adversary in the area, where later the city of Mazaka/ Caesaria was built (i.e. near Mt. Argaeus). There he leaves his kinsman Mšak to govern the country and orders the local inhabitants to speak Armenian. Hence, the Greeks call this region "First Armenia" (Πρώτη Ἀρμενία). According to Markwart, the Armenian eponym **Arimo* became Aram under the influence of the Biblical Aram (the eponym of the Arameans) and the name of the first Urartian king Aramu. As for the ethnonym *Hay*, it is a later form, which originated in Armenia (Markwart 1919, 67-68, Markwart 1928, 215 ff.).

Markwart adopted a critical attitude towards the Greek data on the Phrygian origin of the Armenians, and believed that the Proto-Armenians had moved from the Balkans to Asia Minor earlier in prehistoric times. He also pointed to the presence of numerous non-Indo-European words in Armenian and considered that the Armenians had formed through the merging of different ethnic groups.

Several of Markwart's linguistic, historical and mythological analyses have been accepted and developed in later works (Manuk Abeghyan, N. Adontz, Hakob Manandyan, Boris Piotrovskii, Diakonoff, Suren Eremyan, Vlad Bănăţeanu, G. Sargsyan, present author, et al.). Some have accepted the *Arimoi-Armen* association, while Cappadocia's "First Armenia" appellation has been a basis for considering this territory as the "Primary Armenia." The ethnonym *Armen* is frequently associated with the ethno-toponym *Arme* to the southwest of Lake Van: Urartian **Armini* "inhabitant of Arme," "Armean country" (Diakonoff 1984: 199, n. 115). The *Arimoi*, like Aram, seem to be derived from **rēmo-* "dark, black" (Petrosyan 2002: 45-46).

An essential drawback in Markwart's theory is that as a starting point he acknowledges not the Armenian self-appellation (autonym) *Hay*, but the name given by foreigners (allonym) *Armen*. In historical times the Armenians called themselves exclusively *Hay*. Though it is possible that some groups of the ancestors of the Armenians have been called *Armen*, nevertheless, when discussing the problem of the Armenian ethnogenesis, the ethnonym *Hay* should be regarded as the primary identification marker. This approach is currently not being argued: the contemporary hypotheses of the Armenian ethnogenesis are based on the viewpoints identifying the ethnonym *Hay* with ancient ethno-toponyms attested in cuneiform sources (for the predominant role of the autonym *Hay* in ethnogenetic studies see also Diakonoff 1983a: 167).⁸

⁸ Hence the idea that the Armenians are first attested in the Behistun inscription of the Persian king Darius I (521-520 B.C.) as *Arminiya*, which has circulated in Western publications since the dawn of European Armenology, cannot be regarded as correct. It is only in the sounds of the European languages that the first attestation of the Armenians and Armenia (i.e. the *Hay* tribe and its country) may be associated with the Persian appellations *Arminiya* and *Armīna*. It could be said that this is the

The Hatti Hypothesis

Hay originates from the Hittite ethnonym *Hatti* (cuneiform *ḫ* is pronounced /x/ = German *ch*). The Hittites adopted this name from the previous inhabitants of Asia Minor, the Hattians. It could have become *Hay* through the regularities characteristic for the Armenian language (cf. Arm. *hayr* "father" < **pḫter*-). This hypothesis has been suggested by Peter Jensen (Jensen 1898). It had been supported by Hrachya Acharyan and Hakovbos Tashean (Acharyan 1901: 235; Tashean 1920: 36-37, 83), who after the emergence of the Hayasa hypothesis associated themselves with the latter (Tashean 1934: 339-343; Acharyan 2004: 25). Concerning the historical context, Jensen considered the Armenians as the linguistic successors of the Hittites, which is unacceptable (Hittite is an Indo-European language very different from Armenian). In our times a fervent advocate of this hypothesis was Diakonoff who has elaborated on the problem of Armenian ethnogenesis in detail (Diakonoff 1956; Diakonoff 1968; Diakonoff 1981; Diakonoff 1983; Diakonoff 1983a; Diakonoff 1984; Diakonoff 2005, etc).

The Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I (1116-1090 B.C.) wrote that in the year of his accession, "20,000 Mušku . . ., who had held for 50 years the lands Alzu and Purulumzu . . . captured the land Kadmuḫu" (the first of these countries is the Armenian *Ajnik'*, the second is not identified, and the third is Arm. *Kadmeac' tun* to the south of the Armenian Highland). The king "conquered 12,000 of the troops of the land of the extensive Mušku in battle," deported the rest of the people and united the entire land of the Mušku with Assyria. 4,000 Kašku (another name: Apišlu) and Urumu, "insubmissive troops of the Hatti land, who had seized by force the cities of Šubartu" (in the same region), "fearing battle," submitted to the king and were uprooted (Grayson 1976: 12, 18, 66, 67, 92, 93).

Diakonoff identifies these Muškians as the Proto-Armenians. After the fall of the Hittite empire (ca. 1200 B.C.) the entire multilingual population to the west of the Upper Euphrates was called by the term *Hatti*. In Urartian inscriptions *Hāte* is the name of the land to the west of the confluence of the Upper Euphrates and Aršana (modern Malatia and surroundings). The Muškians, i.e. the Proto-Armenians, might have populated this area as well, as a result of which they were called *Hāte* by the Urartians. Later, this name passed to the Muškians themselves. The Armenized Urartians, appropriating the Muškian-Armenian language, made this term their self-appellation with a derivative form **hātiyos* (i.e. with the Indo-European suffix *-(i)yos), from which the ethnonym *Hay* originated (Diakonoff 1984: 126-127; *Hatio*, as the prototype of *Hay*, figures already in Jensen 1898: 3-4, et passim).

These Muškians are conditionally called "Eastern Muškians" as opposed to the "Western Muškians," i.e. Phrygians, who in cuneiform sources also have been called Mušku. The "Eastern Muškians" are considered a Balkanic tribe, related to but not identical with the Phrygians. The "Thracio-Phrygian" ethnonym *Mus-* known in the Balkans and Western Asia Minor (Μυσία, Moesia) could have spread among all of the related tribes. Moreover, -k in the ethnonym *Mušku* is assumed to be the Armenian plural marker *k'*.

first time that we can identify the *Hay* tribe as *Arminiya*, but this is also disputable (some scholars identify the *Arminiya*s of Darius as non-Armenians: e.g. Urartians, Scythians, see Tashean 1934: 343; Struve 1946; D. Sargsyan 1991).

According to Diakonoff, these Balkanic ancestors of the Armenians could not have passed through all of Asia Minor without leaving any information in the region's written sources during the existence of the Hittite empire. Thus their migration would have occurred after the fall of the Hittites and before the formation of Urartu (i.e. anywhere between 1200 and 860 B.C.). The "Eastern Muškians" would have been the vanguard of the Armeno-Phrygian tribes, which moved from the Balkans to Asia Minor and settled down to the west of the Armenian Highland. There, in Cappadocia, in the land of Tegarama (later Tilgarimmu) they formed their primary cradle, which was echoed in Hayk's patronym T'orgom. Their spreading out in the other regions of the Armenian Highland was greatly assisted by the policy of the Urartian kings, who used to resettle the inhabitants of the conquered lands. Concerning the Armenization of Armenia's historical center—Ayrarat and the Ararat plain—it is notable that Argišti I in 782 B.C. populated the newly built Erebuni fortress (modern Erevan) with 6,600 "military people" from the lands of Hāte and Šupani (i.e. to the west and east of the confluence of the Euphrates and Arsania), who would have been speakers of Proto-Armenian, partially or completely. Initially, the Proto-Armenians had been considerably less in number than the local inhabitants of the Armenian Highland. Nevertheless, due to historical circumstances, their language became the common means of communication, and the other ethnic groups merged with them.

Diakonoff's theory, like others, has several strong and weak points.

- a) The most significant of the strengths is subjective: this is the only theory that has been developed at a high level of modern science and from various aspects. It represents the problems of Armenian ethnogenesis and prehistory based on historical, linguistic and, to some extent, archeological, anthropological, and culturological data.
- b) Its conformity with ancient Greek data that the Armenians are related to the Phrygians.
- c) The territory of Urart. Hāte was later joined to Lesser Armenia. The epithet "lesser" may allude to the primary territory of the tribe, from where its further spreading out started (see below, in connection of the Hayasa hypothesis).
- d) The ethnonyms Urumu and Mušku are comparable with the names of the patriarch Aram and his relative Mšak, governor of Cappadocia, who can be considered the eponyms of these ethnic tribes. This is consonant with the Urumeans' characterization as "troops of the Hatti land" (i.e. Cappadocia) and with the hypothetical spread of the Muškians to the west of the Euphrates (though, according to legend, Aram moves to Cappadocia from Armenia, while, according to this hypothesis, the Armenians came to Armenia from Cappadocia).
- e) The river names Arsania and Melia(ini) indicate that the Armenian element existed in this area before the 9th century B.C.

The weak aspects of the hypothesis are:

- a) The identification of the cuneiform *h* (i.e. /x/) with the Armenian /h/;
- b) Relating the phonetic change *-t- (> t') > -y- in Armenian to later than the 12th century B.C. (there are no other data for this chronology);

- c) The consideration of the ethnonym *Hay* as borrowed, while the eponym is etymologized best as native Indo-European;
- d) The Mušku tribe, in contradistinction to Urumu and Apišlu/Kašku, are not mentioned as “troops of the Hatti land;”
- e) The Armenian hypothetical ethnonym **hatiyo-* is not mentioned in the west of the Armenian Highland in Urartian sources;
- f) The Μοσχοί of Greek sources, whose ethnonym is apparently identical with the Mušku (in cuneiform writing /o/ is presented as u, and /s/ as š), were a different ethnic group than the Armenians and Phrygians.
- g) The mention of Hâte and Muškini as two separate ethno-toponyms in late Urartian sources (i.e. even during the period immediately preceding the fall of Urartu the Muškians were not called *Hatiyo*);
- h) The absence of Proto-Armenian personal names to the west of the Upper Euphrates;
- i) The contradiction with the Armenian ethnogonic myth, where the southwestern areas of the Armenian Highland and, moreover, the western bank of the Euphrates are not mentioned as the stage of activity of the first ethnogonic patriarchs; on the contrary, the Armenization of this area is introduced as a later event dated to the time of the seventh patriarch Aram.

The weaknesses can be overcome theoretically, and the author has touched upon many of them. However, certain problems need special elucidation. First of all, the alleged Armenian protoform for the ethnonym *Hay* **hātiyos* should be revised. For Earliest Armenian the best of all would be the protoform **hāt'iyō-* / **hat'iyō-*: the Indo-European -s ending could have been disappeared in the 12th century B.C.; the Urartian *t* would correspond to Arm. *t' / tʰ /*, which yields *y* in the intervocalic position (for the history of Proto-Armenian and earliest Armenian phonology, see Djahukian 1987: 225-228, 345-348).

Furthermore, the most probable native Armenian etymology of the ethnonym *Hay* contradicts the association of *Hay* with *Hâte*. As it is mentioned above, the figures of the Armenian eponyms are interrelated members of a tripartite mythological system; they have Indo-European parallels, and moreover, their names are at best etymologized from Indo-European roots. If the *Hay* < *Hatti* / *Hâte* etymology is correct, then the Proto-Armenians would have borrowed the ethnonym in the form *Hat'ī*, then reinterpreted it in their own language as “master, lord” and only thereafter created the figure of the patriarch Hayk. It is hard to believe that the conflict and the system of the figures of the ethnogonic myth (Hayk, opposed to Bel, whose name has the same meaning “master, lord”) was invented on the basis of a “folk etymology” of a borrowed ethnonym.

It is necessary to postulate certain preconditions for the *Hay* < *Hatti* / *Hâte* etymology: e.g. the pronunciation of *Hatti* / *Hâte* was *Hatʰi/e*, or: in the 12th century B.C. there was no sound /x/ in Armenian and the local /Xatʰi/e/ had been perceived as *Hat'ī/e*. However, the Hittite *Hatti* in other cuneiform languages has also been recorded with *h*, and *htym* in Hebrew (i.e. with the sound /x/). In ancient Greek, where there was no /x/, the first sound of *Hatti* has been presented with κ: Κήτιοι “Hittites” (*h* in other cases was also transcribed as Gk. κ, cf. e.g. *Hilaku* = Κίλικες); for the Urart. *h* cf. e.g. *Aḫuriani* = Arm. Axurean, *Ḫaliṭu* = Arm. *Xaltik'* (Gk.

Χαλδαῖοι). Thus, the Hittite and Urartian cuneiform *ḫ* in *Ḫatti/ Ḫate* would correspond to /x/. According to linguistic reconstruction, Proto-Armenian would have had the sound /x/ before 12th century B.C. (Djahukian 1987: 25, 228, 346).

However, in Armenian there are cases of correspondence of the cuneiform *ḫ* with both /x/ and /h/. According to John A.C. Greppin, who has especially examined this problem, if there is a correspondence between the Hittite *ḫ* and the Armenian *h*, then the words have a common origin (and Arm. *h* and Hitt.*ḫ* are derived from the Indo-European laryngeals); if there is a correspondence between the Hittite and Hurro-Urartian *ḫ* and the Armenian *x*, then the Armenian words are borrowed (Greppin 1995). If that is the case, *Hay* is not borrowed from the cuneiform *Ḫat(t)i/e*. There are only some theoretical possibilities left: e.g. in an Urartian dialect *Ḫāte* was pronounced *Hāte*,⁹ and Arm. **Ḫat* 'iyo- was derived from that dialectal form.

Diakonoff himself notes the doubtfulness of the equalization of the cuneiform *ḫ* and Armenian /h/, especially as an argument brought against the *Hay* < *Hayasa* etymology, which betrays bias on his part (Diakonoff 1984: 113, 191, n. 52; van Loon 1987: 231). However, he writes in his monograph:

Because of the linguistic uncertainty, the derivation of the term *Hayk* ' from *Hāte*, although most probable, cannot be considered to be conclusively proven . . . and therefore, other etymologies are also possible (Diakonoff 1984: 201, n. 120).

Numerous times he tried to clarify his position, which indicated that he himself was not certain of it (Diakonoff 1968: 211, 236-237, n. 119; Diakonoff 1981: 55, n. 98; Diakonoff 1983a: 172; Diakonoff 2005: 278).

After the fall of the Hittite empire the term *Ḫatti* appears in Assyrian and Babylonian sources as the name of "late-Hittite" lands to the west and southwest of the Upper Euphrates (usually from North Syria to the west of the Armenian Highland, though sometimes it has also been the designation of southern Syria). *Ḫāte* of the Urartian sources is not the alleged Proto-Armenian **ḫat* 'iyo-, but one of the late Hittite lands, Luw. Melid, Urart. Meli ṭea (modern Malatya). The history of these lands ends in 708 B.C., with the downfall of Kummuh (= Gk. Kommagene). *Ḫatti/ Ḫāte* was an appellation used by foreigners which never occurred in the records of the "Ḫatti lands" themselves. The population of this area was diverse: Hittite-Luwian, Hurrian, West Semitic, and the term *Ḫatti* appears to be used rather geographically than ethnically or linguistically (Hawkins 1957-71: 152).

According to Diakonoff, the Muškian Proto-Armenians, as one of the peoples which populated that land (like the Urumeans and the Apišlaians, the "troops of the Ḫatti land"), were probably called *Ḫāte* by the Urartians and later made this term their self-appellation by adding the *-(i)yo- suffix to *Ḫāte*. However, there is no evidence of the presence of the "Eastern Muškians" to the west of the Upper Euphrates. Furthermore, in the records of the Urartian king Rusa II (685-645 B.C.) the land Muškini along with *Ḫāte* and some other lands is mentioned (Arutyunyan 2001: 516; Salvini 2001, 258, 261). Diakonoff and some others identify Muškini with

⁹ In one inscription the name of the supreme god of Urartu, *Ḫaldi*, is rendered as *Aldi* (= *Haldi*?), which has been considered as a dialectal form, see Melikishvili 1960: 84, 86; Arutyunyan 2001: 476.

Phrygia. Nevertheless, Muškini is listed between Hāte and Haliṭu (the latter is identified with Arm. *Xatik*, Gk. Χαλδαῖοι to the northwest of the Armenian Highland, in Pontus), and may be localized not far from those lands, somewhere in the west of the Armenian Highland (Arutyunyan 1985: 146-147; Çilingiroğlu and Salvini 2001: 20; Salvini 2001a: 266).¹⁰ As has been noted, Hāte represents the region of Malatya, and not the alleged **hat* 'iyo- 'Proto-Armenians.' If in the middle of the 7th century B.C. a tribe was still called *Muški*- in Urartian and was contrasted with *Hāte*, then it could have not been called *Hāte* (and later by a derivative of *Hāte*) anymore, as the Hatti/ Hāte lands had already vanished and Urartu would follow soon.

Diakonoff's hypothesis identifying the "Eastern Muškians" as Proto-Armenian newcomers from the Balkans is based on the identity of the ethnonym *Mušku* with the Assyrian appellation of the Phrygians (Assyrian sources of the end of the 8th century B.C. mention the Mušku king Mita, who is identified with the Phrygian king Midas). This is nothing but a speculative assumption, as there is no evidence of the language of the Muškians. Moreover, there are other hypotheses on the "Eastern Muškians," whose ethnonym seems to be preserved in Gk. Μοσχολί and Georgian *Mesxi*: e.g. they could have been early inhabitants of the Armenian Highland or a neighboring area, who later constituted a part of the Phrygians and gave them their own name (for the Muškians see Mellink 1965; Sevin 1991: 96-97; Kosyan 1997; Kosyan 1999a: 162-167, with bibliography; Kosyan 2002; Khazaradze 2002; Petrosyan 2002: 139 ff., 152 ff.; Petrosyan 2006: 56 ff.).

Diakonoff's localization of "Primary Armenia" is also questionable. According to him, the ancient legends consider the "basin of Upper Euphrates" as the Armenian homeland. This is what the researchers have thought, while the Armenian legend localizes the domain of the patriarch Hayk to the north of Lake Van, in the area of the Aršana's (Eastern Euphrates, Murat-su) upper streams in the district of Hark'. Only Strabo's legend considers the area of the (Western) Euphrates' most upper streams (Gk. Akilisene) as the Armenians' primary territory. Diakonoff, as a result of poor knowledge of the Armenian data, confounds these two territories (Diakonoff 1984: 115, 192, n. 61). The straight-line distance between the centers of these districts—Manazkert and Erzuka (Turk. Malazgirt and Erzincan)—is 240 km. (148.8 miles)! Both these districts are located very far from Hāte-Malatya (370 km. [229.4 miles] from Manazkert and 170 km. [105.4 miles] from Erzuka), where, according to the author, the Proto-Armenian "Eastern Muškians" should have adopted their "Hittite" ethnonym.

Diakonoff considers the lands of Išua and Alzi as the country of the "Eastern Muškians" and views the area lying from Šubria to the basin of the Upper Euphrates on both sides of the river, i.e. Paḥhuwa, Zuhma, Tegarama, Išua, Maldia, and Alzi of Hittite sources and Arme (Šubria) of Urartian sources, as the territory where the Muškian-Proto-Armenians spread out (i.e. historical Sophene/ Cop'k' and its neighboring areas). The prototypes of the ethnonyms *Hay*, *Armen*, and *Somexi* (Georg. "Armenian") are seen in the toponyms Hatti, Arme and Suḫmu located in this area.

¹⁰ According to A. Kosyan, it seems unlikely that, prior to its downfall, Urartu would raid the depths of Asia Minor through the powerful realm of Melid and bring back captives from Phrygia (Kosyan 1999: 247, 250). The name of the city of Muš (Turk. Muş) to the west of Lake Van may be derived from the ethnonym of the Muškians (Diakonoff 1984: 195, n. 87), which leads to the localization of Muškini in Šubria (Petrosyan 2002: 142).

Nonetheless, as we have seen, the *Hatti* > *Hay* etymology is highly hypothetical, the connection between *Suhmu* and *Somexi* is unacceptable (Djahukian 1987: 288), and moreover, Arme is situated very far from Cop'k' and the basin of the Upper Euphrates. The fact that Diakonoff does not mention Hayasa, to the north of Cop'k', exactly in "the basin of Upper Euphrates" betrays his bias against the Hayasa hypothesis.

The weakest point of Diakonoff's theory is that he does not present names from this hypothetical broad cradle of the Armenians and its neighboring territory that can be etymologized in Armenian more or less reliably. From the data of that period the only valid argument of people's ethnic origins can be the linguistic affiliation of their personal names. As Diakonoff has pointed out, in the pre-Achaemenian ancient Orient there were only local community cults. "Confessional" names were not in use and personal names usually had some specific well-wishing meaning in a person's native language and in connection with his/her local cult (Diakonoff 1984: 203, n. 135). Among the personal names of this area none have an Armenian appearance. According to onomastic and historical data the region was populated by the Hurrians and Luwians since the second half of the second millennium B.C. Until the 8th century B.C., the names of the rulers of the Upper Euphrates' right bank, including Melitea-Melid, were primarily Luwian,¹¹ while in areas southwest of Lake Van they were Hurrian. Later, to the west of the Euphrates there appeared a few new names that would have been connected with a new ethnic unit. Some of them are comparable with Phrygian names known from Greek legends.¹²

While writing about the difficulty in identifying the Armenian element in the names of the territory marked out as the earliest Armenian lands, Diakonoff mentions that local onomastics is incomplete and theoretically it is possible that the Armenians also bore Hurrian and Luwian personal names (Diakonoff 1984: 124, 129-130, 197-198, n. 106, 203, n. 135). However, the Urartian onomastics is incomplete elsewhere and the same speculative assumption may be admitted for the personal names of the other regions of Urartu. At the same time he adduces a few names which, again theoretically, can be of Armenian origin or have an Armenian part (Diakonoff 1981, 58-60, n. 115; Diakonoff 1983a: 164-165, n. 53, 170, n. 65; Diakonoff 1992: 51-52). Nevertheless, these etymologies are speculative and absolutely unconvincing.¹³

The newcomers would have probably formed the ruling elite of the population. However, nowhere in Urartu are the non-Armenian origins of the personal names of the local governors so evident than in this alleged area of "Primary Armenia." Obviously, the governors, whose names were Luwian or Hurrian, would have had respective Luwian or Hurrian origins. There is also no objective (i.e. linguistic) basis for attributing an Armenian origin to the 6,600 settlers of Erebuni (for their probable Luwian origin see Melikishvili 1958; Petrosyan 2006: 31 ff.; Tiratsyan 2006). To

¹¹ For the etymologies of approximately 200 names of the rulers of the post-Hittite "Hatti lands," the overwhelming majority of which are apparently Luwian, see Kosyan 1994: 88-97 (there are also approximately 10 Hurrian, one Semitic, and several Phrygian and unidentified names).

¹² Those new names are: Kurtis/ Gurdi, Mitas, Asku(i)s, Iš(ik)kallu, Mugallu, from which the first three are compared with Phryg. Gordios, Midas, Askanius, while the others remain obscure.

¹³ Thus, Iš(ik)kallu is interpreted as Arm. **hskēal*, **hskawl*, cf. (h)*skem* "to work, fag, watch" of obscure (Hittite?) origin (suggestion of A. Perikhanian); the ending of the toponym Tumeiški, as well as of the ethnonym Mušku/i is identified with the Armenian plural marker k'. Such arbitrary interpretations of a few sporadic names cannot be regarded as serious. Note that many more probable if not obvious Armenian names can be found in Urartu elsewhere (see above).

sum up, the theory of the Armenian origin of the population of this region does not have objective arguments.

If that is the case, where have the Armenians been hidden? There is no other way to identify the Proto-Armenian speakers in any area, but to display believable Proto-Armenian names. A strong argument in favor of Diakonoff's theory could have been the above-mentioned Proto-Armenian etymologies of the river names Aršana and Melia-*ini*. However, as we will see, these names could have been derived from the language of the migrants from Hayaša and/or the eastern territories of the Armenian Highland and hence considered as arguments for not only Diakonoff's but also for the following two hypotheses.

At the beginning of the Iron Age (12th century B.C.) in the territories lying to the east of the Upper Euphrates (historical Cop'k') new archaeological evidence appears that essentially differs from the previous period and can be characterized by the peculiar pottery of "Transcaucasian" type. Moreover, the local old archaeological monuments have all been destroyed by fire. The Late Bronze Age culture vanishes entirely and is replaced by a new one. On the other hand, on the western bank of the Euphrates, in Malatya, the previous (Hittite) period culture continues; the new pottery that has flooded the eastern bank appears in the west later (the 8th century B.C.). This could be connected with the invasion of the "Eastern Muškians" and the tribes accompanying them (Sevin 1991: 96-97). As we have seen, the Assyrian sources call some of these invaders (except the Muškians) "troops of the Hatti land," thus attributing to them a western origin, which seems to contradict the eastern ("Transcaucasian") associations of the newly appeared pottery. According to A. Kosyan's detailed discussion, the only plausible assumption which will fit these two sources (Assyrian and archaeological) is a location of the Muškians and others before their migrations in the area which in some earlier date was under Hittite political influence, i.e. the region of Hayaša (Kosyan 1997; Kosyan 1999a: 160-162, with bibliography).

According to P.S. Avetisyan, the assortment of the new pottery that appeared in the west of the Highland at the beginning of the Iron Age "by its morphological characteristics is literally identical" with the assortment of the area of the present-day Republic of Armenia of the previous epoch (last stages of the Late Bronze Age). Moreover, there is every reason to believe that during the 13th-12th centuries B.C. the population in some regions of present-day Armenia had abruptly decreased. Hence, this movement could have originated from the territory of present-day Armenia (Avetisyan 2004). These interpretations of the archaeological data exclude the immigration of the "Eastern Muškians" from the Balkans and their settlement in Hata-Malatya.

Thus, the main points of Diakonoff's theory have strong counterarguments. The *Hay* > *Hatti* etymology remained doubtful even for Diakonoff. The Mušku/i-Moschoi probably played an important role in the prehistory of Armenia and Georgia, although their identification with the Proto-Armenians is speculative and indefensible. As concerns the prehistory of Armenia, elaboration of the problem, and theoretical theses, Diakonoff's works maintain their value.

The Hayaša Hypothesis

The ethnonym *Hay* is connected with the ethno-toponym Hayaša (Haiasa, Hajasa, /Xayasa/) attested in Hittite sources. The ending *-(a)ša* is considered a suffix.

This kingdom, or, to be more exact, the western part of this kingdom, was also known as Azzi. Hayaša-Azzi was the most significant state of the Armenian Highland in the second millennium B.C. (mentioned in the 14th-13th centuries). It included some territories of Lesser and Greater Armenias, especially the area of the upper streams and headwaters of the Euphrates. The Hayaša hypothesis has been supported by the overwhelming majority of the specialists familiar with the problem, as well as numerous distinguished scholars who have touched upon it. Norayr A. Martirosean (1924) was the first to express an opinion on the Hayaša-Hay association, followed by Karl Roth (1927), Grigori Kapantsian (1931-33), Paul Kretschmer (1932), A. Khach'atryan (1933), et al. Kapantsian has presented this hypothesis as a monograph (Kapantsian 1947). Among the supporters of this hypothesis, in its various formulations, one can mention such authorities as Manandyan, Piotrovskii, G.A. Melikishvili, Eremyan, Vladimir Georgiev, Bănăteanu, Cyril Toumanoff, Djahukian, Charles Burney, David Marshall Lang, Ivanov, T. Gamkrelidze, G. Sargsyan.¹⁴ Diakonoff was the only celebrated expert familiar with the problem who did not accept this viewpoint.

The most complete work on the Hayaša hypothesis remains Kapantsian's monograph *Hayasa—Cradle of Armenians*. Kapantsian was exceptionally knowledgeable in the history, languages and cultures of Armenia and neighboring ancient and contemporary peoples, however he was also a follower of N. Marr and had unacceptable views in linguistics. This substantially weakens and in some points devalues his work. He considered Armenian the successor of the Hayasan language, but denied the essential role of the Indo-European succession in it. He etymologized the place, personal, and deity names of Hayaša mainly from Hurrian and, to a lesser degree, other ancient, mainly non-Indo-European languages of the region. From a correct linguistic standpoint these interpretations can be regarded as proof of Hayaša's non-Armenian nature (Bănăteanu 1961: 105-106; Djahukian 1961: 354-356; Djahukian 1987: 322-323; Diakonoff 1984: 114).

Scholars of the next generation have accepted the *Hay-Hayaša* link based on a correct methodological basis (not questioning the Indo-European nature of the Armenian language). Some have considered Hayasan as a local language different from Armenian, others as the predecessor of Armenian, although without bringing satisfactory and convincing linguistic arguments. Some have juxtaposed the Hayasan and Balkanic standpoints, assuming that the Armenians, after coming from the Balkans, adopted their ethnonym from the aborigines of Hayasa (Manandyan, Toumanoff, Djahukian, Burney and Lang, et al.).

The works of Djahukian have played a significant role in the development and outreach of this hypothesis. Accepting Hayasa's essential role in the process of development of the Armenian people, Djahukian, based on an examination of the available onomastic data, initially considered Hayasan as an Anatolian, i.e. Indo-European, though not Armenian, language. He localized the Proto-Armenians in the Balkan Peninsula until the 12th century B.C., when along with the Phrygians, they

¹⁴ Manandyan 1944: 32-33; Manandyan 1956; Piotrovskii 1945: 25-26; Piotrovskii 1946: 33-35; Melikishvili 1954: 85, 418; Eremyan 1958; Georgiev 1958: 71; Georgiev 1960: 39; Bănăteanu 1961; Djahukian 1961; Djahukian 1988a; Toumanoff 1963: 59; Burney and Lang 1971: 179; Ivanov 1983: 30-33; Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984: 913; G. Sargsyan 1988: 51-52; G. Sargsyan 1992. The Hayasa hypothesis has also been embraced by many other scholars, see Barseghyan 1996: 156 ff.

moved to the east of Asia Minor, where they merged with the Hayasans, Luwians, Urartians and other local tribes (Djahukian 1961; Djahukian 1967: 331-332; Djahukian 1976; Djahukian 1987, 282-285, 322-341). However, in 1987 he changed his opinion and suggesting Armenian etymologies for some Hayasan names joined those who considered Hayasan as Proto-Armenian (Djahukian 1988a; Djahukian 1990; Djahukian 1992a: 46-53).

Following are two more versions of the hypothesis:

a) Some scholars link the ethnonym *Hay* with the Balkanic tribe Παῖνες (based on the *p- > h- change in Armenian), which is mentioned among the tribes fighting against the Greeks at Troy. Georgiev, proceeding from the assumption that the *Paiones* have a Phrygian origin, has interpreted their ethnonym from the Indo-European *pow- "little, small" (from the protoform *pawyon-). This tribe could have migrated into Asia Minor and established Hayasa. Notably, the name of Lesser Armenia calls to mind the presumed meaning of the ethnonym "little, small" (Georgiev 1958: 171; Georgiev 1960: 39). Even though G. Djahukian regards this view as improbable, he still adduces the word *hay* "little, small" in the medieval dictionary of Eremia of Metri as a supporting argument (Djahukian 1961: 386-387; Djahukian 1987: 283). L.A. Gindin, based on Oleg Trubachev's interpretation of the *Paiones*, considers it possible that they were the predecessors of the Armenians, who in the 15th century B.C. passed through Troy and established Hayasa (Gindin 1993: 82-85, cf. Trubachev 2003: 162-163).

b) Certain names taken from the earliest cuneiform sources that are similar to the ethnonym *Hay* have been associated with the Hayasa hypothesis. Ivanov adduces the onomastic element *Ha-a* (possible pronunciation: *haya*) known from the third millennium B.C. inscriptions of Ebla and Mesopotamia. It appears along with the names *Armi* and *Azi* (cf. *Arme/Urme* and *Azzi* in the Armenian Highland), which may substantiate this assumption (Ivanov 1983: 30-33).

According to Artak Movsisyan, the ethnonym *Hay* may be connected with the Sumerian *ĦA.A*, one of the Sumerian denominations of the land *Š/Subur / Šubari* (Sumer. *ŠU.BUR*, *SU.BUR*, *SU.BIR*, *SU*, *SU.A*, Akkad. *Šubartu*, *Subartum*, *Šubari*), which embraces the territory of Northern Mesopotamia and the southern parts of the Armenian Highland. Furthermore, Aratta of the Sumerian epic texts should be identified with *Š/Subur* (they both were ideographically rendered as *SU.KUR.RU*). The name of the eponymous ancestor Hayk is comparable with that of the Akkadian god *Ħaya/ Ea* (Sumer. *Enki*), who has been portrayed with the rivers Euphrates and Tigris flowing from his shoulders and should be localized in the region of their springs, i.e. in the Armenian Highland. The name *Šubur / Šubari* has been preserved in the Assyrian name of the land *Šubria* to the southwest of Lake Van, mentioned in the 11th-7th centuries B.C., whereas the latter has been called *Arme* (and its eastern part *Urme*) in Urartian sources. Thus, the names of *Š/Subur* are comparable with the Armenian ethnonyms *Hay* and *Armen*, and the inhabitants of *Šubur* and *Aratta* may be identified as Proto-Armenians (Movsisyan 2000: 7-8, 36-38, 40-47).

Kapantsian represented the transition Hayasa-Armenia, which was interrupted by the Urartian period, as follows. The collapse of the Hittite Empire resulted in the consolidation of Hayasa. An ethnic advancement of Hayasan-Armenians from

Hayasa towards Malatya, and, consequently, the occupation of all territories of Lesser Armenia, is assumed. The local population merged with the Armenians. At the end of the 7th century B.C. they started to advance southeast from Malatya to Cop'k', then towards Aġnik' and further southeast. In the 6th century B.C., because of the strong opposition of the local tribes and the Persian state they started settling in the western territories of Urartu and ultimately appropriate the whole Highland. There had also been a movement to the east from Hayasa, as a result of which the Ararat valley became Armenized in the 4th century B.C. Kapantsian compares the movements of the Armenians from the southern parts of Urartu to the north with the legends of Hayk and his son Aramaneak. These legends are considered reflections of historical movements of the Armenians in the late Urartian period (Kapantsian 1947: 123 ff., 155 ff.).

This problem has also been developed in the works of other authors (Manandyan, Eremyan, G. Sargsyan and others). Many of them have tried to reconcile the existing viewpoints. Manandyan, following Markwart, considered the *Arimoi* of Homer as the speakers of Proto-Armenian. He localized Hayasa in the area of Lake Van, hence identifying it with Hark', the domain of Hayk. Eremyan identified the Proto-Armenian-Arimoi with the Urumeans, who have been called *Hay* by the name of Hayasa. Both authors have dated the occupation of the main territories of Greater Armenia by the Armenians around post-Urartian times.

G. Sargsyan also does not stray too far from the theses of previous researchers. He notes that the experts (Kapantsian, Eremyan, Piotrovskii, Diakonoff, Melikishvili and others) distinguish the valley of the upper reaches of the Euphrates as the primary cradle of the formation of the Armenian people in the second half of the second millennium B.C. This is the area mentioned by Diakonoff, plus the territory of Hayasa. This area, i.e. Hayasa and the "late-Hittite" kingdoms, was "ethnically saturated with the Armenian element." The Armenians came to Hayk's cradle Hark' through Malatya and its neighboring lands. The evidence of this is the representation of Hayk as T'orgom's son (the latter is the eponym of the Biblical "house of T'orgom," i.e. Cappadocia). In the 12th century B.C. the Urumeans (with whom the ethnonym *Armen* is connected) and the Muški conquer the southwestern parts of the Armenian Highland. As a result there arises a huge Armenian "ethno-linguistic mass," stretching to the center of the Highland and being mentioned by various names. These masses were in conflict with Urartu. The Muš valley (Taron) and the country of Urme are considered the boiling point of the collision, the "bastion of the Armenian ethno-linguistic mass." The existence of the Armenian islets in the east of the Highland also cannot be excluded, from which the 6,600 captives resettled in Erebuni by Argišti I are mentioned. The movement of Hayk from Babylon to Hark' is to be regarded as the biblicalized version of the original legend reflecting the historical movement of the Armenians from Cappadocia to Hark' (created in the second half of the second millennium—the beginning of the first millennium B.C.). The assumption of the eastern regions of the Highland by the successors of Hayk is dated by the historical events of the 8th-6th centuries B.C. Thus the formation of the Armenian nation ends (G. Sargsyan 1988; G. Sargsyan 1992).

This reconstruction, like its predecessors, is mainly speculative. There is no linguistic or other real evidence for considering the late-Hittite kingdoms and the neighboring countries in the east (which, except for the western part of Cop'k', can

hardly be regarded as “late Hittite”) as “saturated” with an Armenian element, Taron and Urme as an Armenian “bastion,” and the language of the resettlers of Erebuni as Armenian. If such evidence did exist, then problem of the Armenian ethnogenesis would be much closer to its solution.

There are several strong arguments supporting the Hayasa hypothesis:

- a) The localization of Hayasa-Azzi in the primary territories of Lesser Armenia Μικρά Ἀρμενία, Armenia Minor, Arm. *P'ok'r Hayk'*, the area of the upper flows of the Euphrates, Čorox, Gayl and Halis rivers) is suggestive. This term is first attested in Greek sources (since the 3rd century B.C.), however it can imply earlier ideas. The epithet “greater, major” was usually given to the late, secondarily subdued lands, while the primary homelands were labeled as ‘little, lesser, minor’, e.g. Lesser Phrygia, Lesser Poland, Lesser Russia (Trubachev 2003: 165-166, cf. Kapantsian 1947: 234; nonetheless cf. also “Little Armenia” used for Cilicia, Armenized in the Middle Ages, or an area in modern Hollywood).
- b) According to the Greek legend, the Argonaut Armenos initially settled in Akilisene, i.e. Arm. Ekeleac' district and surroundings, which has been regarded as the core area of former Azzi-Hayasa.
- c) The land to which the Argonauts set off is called Αἶα (Aia) in ancient sources. This term can be juxtaposed with Hayaša (Toumanoff 1963: 57-58, with earlier bibliography; Petrosyan 1997: 65-69; Petrosyan 2002: 44) and regarded as an argument for the pronunciation /Hayasa/ rather than /Xayasa/; if so, this ethno-toponym has only been transcribed as Hayaša in Hittite cuneiform writing.
- d) The main temples of the majority of the Armenian pre-Christian gods—Aramazd, Anahit, Mihr, Nane, and Baršamin—were concentrated in the area of Akilisene (the districts of Daranali, Ekeleac', and Derjan).
- e) Armenos, as an Armenian eponym, corresponds to the patriarch Aram, who, on the other hand, could eponymize the Urumeans. As we have seen, the initial territory of this tribe could have been in Hayasa.

The weak points are:

- a) the identification of the cuneiform ḫ as /h/;
- b) the cuneiform Haya- instead of the anticipated cuneiform Ayu (= *Hayo);
- c) the suffix -(a)ša was not widespread in the region;
- d) the Proto-Armenian element is not evident in the onomastics of Hayasa;
- e) the primary territories of Hayasa do not play a role and are not even mentioned in the legends of the Armenian ethnogenesis; and
- f) the absence of ethno-toponyms comparable with Hayaša after the Hittite epoch.

Despite its apparent similitude the correspondence of the sound /h/ with the cuneiform ḫ in the *Hay* < *Hatti* and *Hay* < *Hayaša* etymologies is not identical. In the first case the ethnonym *Hay* is considered borrowed from *Hatti*, while in the second it is the ethnonym *Hay*, foreign for the Hittites, that is considered to be presented in the cuneiform writing as *Hay-* (in the first case the foreign /x/ is

assumed to be reflected in Armenian as /h/, while in the second the Proto-Armenian /h/ is assumed to be presented in the cuneiform writing as /x/. As has been said, according to Greppin, in the Armenian-Hittite parallels the correspondence of the Armenian h and the Hittite ḫ hints at a common Indo-European origin. *Ḫayaša* is not a Hittite word, but the name of a country foreign to the Hittites, so this approach is not applicable here. Nevertheless, we can note that if *Hay* and *Ḫayaša* /*Xayasa*/ are somehow connected with each other, then it is the Hittite *Ḫayaša* that originates from the local, possibly Armenian, *Hay*.

The land Aia later has been identified with Colchis (in late sources Aia is a city located on the river Rion). Early Colchis, Urart. Qulḫa, attested in the 8th century B.C., was located in the basin of the Čorox (Turk. Çoruh) River (Melikishvili 1962), and thus overlapped the territory of former Hayasa. Therefore, Aia may be equated with Hayasa. The legend of the Argonauts and the land Aia are dated to the generation prior to the war of Troy (13th century B.C.), which is the period of Hayasa's existence. Thus, notwithstanding the skepticism of some scholars, the mythical Aia really could correspond to the terrestrial Hayasa (can such a similarity between two names of the same territory dated to the same period be coincidental?). A comparison of the Hittite *Ḫayaša* and the Greek *Aia* shows that the stem of this country name would be *Hay*. The ethnonym *Hay* is restored as **Hayo-*, however, as mentioned above, the -o ending could have been added at a later stage of development. Is it not possible that *Ḫaya-* was a toponym derived from the ethnonym *Hay* (with the suffix *-ya), further suffixed with the Anatolian -ša? In any event, it is more probable that the foreign /h/ was communicated as the cuneiform ḫ, than that the foreign sound /x/ was perceived as the sound /h/ in earliest Armenian.

In this hypothesis the Armenian ethnos does not appear in the Urartian records by its name. In the ocean of the Urartian onomastics there are no names that contain the element *ḫay(a)-* (Hayasa is not recalled after the Hittite period; in its place the Urartian sources mention the kingdom of Diauhi). Also, there is no information in the Urartian sources that would hint at the conquest of the Highland by the people of Hayasa. The absence of historically recorded succession from Hayasa to post-Urartian Armenia is considered one of the primary important bases for negating the Hayasa hypothesis (Diakonoff 1983a: 172; Diakonoff 1984: 113). This is the main reason for G. Sargsyan's historical interpretation of this hypothesis being in some points almost identical with Diakonoff's theory (except the including of Hayasa in the territory of the primary cradle of the formation of the Armenian people). This, of course, does not mean that there are no other possibilities. In his works G. Djahukian has proposed an alternative standpoint on the Hayasa-Hayk transition based on onomastic evidence, which, regrettably, has not been discussed in a historical context.¹⁵

As has been noted, the localization of the domain of the forefather Hayk to the north of Lake Van in the district of Hark' cannot be explained mythologically, but could have a historical basis. The Hayasa-Hayk' succession would be acceptable if

¹⁵ Adducing some parallels between the onomastics of Hayasa and other regions of Armenia, attested in Urartian times (Azzi-'Aza, Ḫuggana-Ḫuka, Baltaik-Baltulḫi, Arḫita-Arḫi, Arniya-Arna, Duqqama-Duqama, Ḫalimana-Ulmanina, Elamunia, Alamun, Parraya-Parra) the author assumes that there could have been a movement from Hayasa to the south and east up to the south of Lake Urmia, see e.g. Djahukian 1988: 159-161. For a criticism of this view, see Diakonoff 1984: 191, n. 50.

Hayasa included the territory of Hayk's domain. Several arguments in support of this thesis may be adduced.

- a) One of Hayasa's cities has been situated on the shore of the sea, which, according to some researchers, could have been Lake Van (Forrer 1931: 17-18; Manandyan 1956: 99 f.; Haas 1986: 23; Kosyan 2004, 38-39). However, there is no reliable data and any localization is very conjectural.
- b) The Hayasan toponym *Arhita* may correspond with the Urartian *Arhi* located not far from Muš (Djahukian 1964: 19).¹⁶ G. Sargsyan identifies the latter with Arm. *Hark'*, the domain of the forefather Hayk.

One of the essential weak points of this hypothesis, like in the previous one, is the absence of names reliably etymologized from (Proto-) Armenian in the supposed primary territories of the Proto-Armenians. It has been noted that the Hayasan names are few in number. Furthermore, while the names derived from any language are indicative of the presence of that language in a country, the absence of such names cannot be considered as a proof of the absence of the language; e.g. in late Hittite onomastics the Hittite element is insignificant (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984: 913). Djahukian has tried to fill this gap in his later works, yet nevertheless the suggested Armenian etymologies of the names of Hayasa (especially of the personal names) are speculative and disputable,¹⁷ whereas there are names that seem to have apparent Anatolian and Balkanic parallels.¹⁸ The Armenian etymologies suggested by other authors are more questionable.

It is necessary to give special consideration to the theory of the Armenization of the west of the Upper Euphrates. The idea that the Armenians had a cradle somewhere in southern Cappadocia, to the west of Malatya (e.g. at Mt. Argaeus), for a long time has been the point of departure of researchers. This approach has been dominant not only in the circles of the supporters of Markwart and Diakonoff, but also of the Hayasa hypothesis (Kapantsian, Manandyan, Eremyan, and G. Sargsyan), who also take the Proto-Armenians from Hayasa to Cappadocia, the region of Malatya, and only then to Greater Armenia (see especially Diakonoff 1981; G.

¹⁶ Note that this may be regarded as an argument for the chronology of the Armenian change **t > y* (*Arhita > Arhiya > Arhi*), which, in this case, could be dated from the last epoch of the Hittite Empire to the formation of Urartu (13th-9th century B.C.), which is important for the Hatti hypothesis.

¹⁷ Here I represent some examples from Djahukian 1990: 26-27: toponyms: *Hayaša* – Arm. *Hay* “Armenian” (< **poti* “master”), *Azzi* – *az* “dry,” *Ingalawa* – *enkal* “to receive,” or *angl* “vulture,” *Arziya* – *arc* “white, bright,” *Lahirhila* – *hiw/xul* “hut”; anthroponyms: *Aišiya* – *ayc-i* “goat,” *Aniya* – *hani* “grandmother, ancestor,” *Mariya* – *mari* “she-bird”; theonyms: *Terittitunni* – **erttun* “three-tailed,” *Šilili* [...] – *šilel* “lover.” Unfortunately, it is impossible to consider these etymologies in this article, however, I would like to make a few remarks: the *Hay* < **poti* etymology may support the Etiunian hypothesis as well (see below); the correspondence of the Hittite cuneiform *š* (= *s*) and Arm. *c*, *zz* (= *ts*) and *z*, *i* and *u* are doubtful; *Terittitunni* is reminiscent of Balkanic theonyms (cf. Gk. *Τριτων*, *Τριτωνός*, *Τιτωός*, *Τιτῶνες*); *Šilili* is a conjectural reading (only the *Ši-il-* fragment is preserved); the localization of *Arziya* in Hayasa is questionable (for updated localizations and readings see Kosyan 2004; Kosyan 2005). All of the etymologies are arbitrary, because we do not have any data for the interpretation of names. This does not diminish the value of Djahukian's work, but emphasizes the hypothetical character of such etymologies.

¹⁸ *Huggannaš* is comparable to Lycian *xuga* “grandfather,” while *Midaš* (a 15th century chieftain of the region of Hayasa) and *Karanniš* may be compared with the legendary kings of Macedonia *Midas* and *Karanos* (Petrosyan 1997: 82-86; Petrosyan 2002: 154, n. 523).

Sargsyan 1992; Kosyan 1998). However, as we have seen, in Malatya and in the neighboring western areas no traces of the Proto-Armenians have been discovered, while in the legends of the Haykids those territories are not mentioned until the patriarch Aram's mythical victory near Mt. Argaeus in Cappadocia.

"First Armenia" is the name of a Roman province in Capadocia, created in the 4th century A.D. and there is no real basis to regard it as a reminiscence of prehistoric times. Hayk's patronymic T'orgom has been brought forward to confirm the Cappadocian origins of the Armenians. T'orgom eponymizes the Biblical Beth Togarmah, Arm. *Tun T'orgomay* "T'orgom's house" (Hebr. *Twgrmh*, *Tgrmh*, *Trgmh*; Gk. *Θοργαμά*, *Θωργαμά*, *Θεργαμά*), which corresponds to Assy. *Tegarama*, Hitt. *Te/akarama*, Luw. *Lakarama* located to the west of Malatya. T'orgom is a descendant of Gomer/Gamer, who eponymizes Cappadocia (Gen. 10.2-3; Xorenac'i 1.5; 1.9; 1.12; cf. Arm. *Gamirk* "Cappadocia"). However, the T'orgomian genealogy of the Armenians is a late invention. In Josephus Thogrames figures as the forefather of the Phrygians, while the Armenians are represented as the descendants of Aram's son Oulos. For the first time Thorgama is associated with the Armenians in the works of the early Christian authors Hippolytus and Eusebius, in the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D. (Adontz 1927: 190-191; Adontz 1946: 319 f.). From there this genealogy passes to the works of the Armenian authors: Agat'angelos, P'avstos, Xorenac'i, Anonym, and others. The idea that T'orgom is the Armenians' ancestor could have originated from the traditional Phrygian origin of the Armenians and the fact that Armenia borders Cappadocia. The next step was to consider T'orgom's brother Ask'anaz as the ancestor of the Armenians (for the first time in Koriwn, in the 5th century A.D.).

Thus, while there is significant literature on the Armenians' T'orgomian-Cappadocian cradle, it is based only on a later interpretation of biblical genealogies and their reconciliation with the legend of Aram's battle in Cappadocia. This is a result of scholars' aspiration to prove the thesis of the western origin of the Armenians. Hayk's T'orgomian genealogy can also have a mythical basis: T'orgom / Tegarama could have been confounded with the name of the Anatolian thunder god Tarḫu- / Tarku- (Adontz 1927: 191; Petrosyan 2002: 57). It should be noted that the early Lesser Armenia was situated to the northwest of Greater Armenia and northern Cappadocia and did not include the area of Malatya and its western region.

Concerning the comparison of the early Mesopotamian *H.A.A*, *Ha.a* and *Hayaša*, even though it is not sufficiently developed it is still promising. In this case, we need to work out the ways in which the historical development of *H.A.A* (Šubur)- *Hayaša*-Hayk' could come about.

Thus, the Hayasa hypothesis, which is widely held among specialists, also has its weak points and underdeveloped theses. On the one side, it seems difficult to deny that two such similar names—Hayasa and Hay-k'—are connected with each other (other arguments in favor of the hypothesis are the localization of the followers of the forefather Armenos and Armenian pre-Christian temples in the region of former Azzi-Hayasa). On the other side, there are difficulties that make it hard to accept the Hayasa-Armenia succession.

The Etiuni Hypothesis

The ethnonym *Hay* is connected with the ethno-toponym *Etiu*- attested in Urartian sources of the 9th-7th centuries B.C. (presented in derivative forms:

^{KUR}Etiuni / Etiuhi "Etiunian land"). The territory of this country basically corresponds with the Ayrarat province of Greater Armenia (Arutyunyan 1985: 262 f.). One of the possible prototypes of the ethnonym *Hay*, as we have seen, could have been **hat'iyō-* from the Indo-European **poti-yō-* or, if it is linguistically and historically possible, from *Hatti*. There are no cuneiform signs for the sound /o/. It has been conveyed as u; almost always the Urartian cuneiform u conveys /o/, and Diakonoff, in the English version of his book, transcribes Etiu as Etio (Diakonoff 1984: 133-134, n. 21). There are no cuneiform signs for the sound /h/ either, and it could have been left out.¹⁹ The Urartian e probably sounded like wide /ε/ or even as /æ/. This is possibly the reason that in Armeno-Urartian parallels in the beginning of words the Urartian e usually corresponds with the Armenian a (Diakonoff 1958: 48-49; Djahukian 1987: 428, 431, 441, cf. e.g. Urart. *huri* "master," vs. Arm. *awriord* "maiden, master's daughter"). It can be assumed that in ancient Armenian, or at least in one of its dialects, the sound /a/ had such a (closed) pronunciation, that it was perceived and transcribed as e /ε/æ/ in Urartian. Hence, the Proto-Armenian **hat'iyō-* could have been transcribed in Urartian as *etiu* (the e/a variance is common in the renderings of foreign names, cf. e.g. Assy. Enzite = Arm. Anjit, Arm. Ekeleac' = Gk. Ἀκίλισσηνῆ).

In this hypothesis, it is not obligatory to date the Armenian change of the Indo-European intervocalic *t > (t') > y after the 9th century B.C. As the ethnonym of the tribe dominating over a significant part of the Highland *Et'io* < **hat'iyō-* could have passed to Urartian sometime long before the formation of Urartu. It could have remained in Urartian in this archaic form, whereas the original **hat'iyō-* could already have been transformed into *hayō* in Etiunian-Armenian in the Urartian times.

Thus, according to this hypothesis, Armenia of the Urartian period appears in Urartian sources as *Etiu-ni/hi*. This was proposed by the present author in 1983.

At the beginning of the first millennium B.C. Etiuni was a significant tribal confederation that included the central and northern regions of the Armenian Highland. Unfortunately, the history of Etiuni, as well as the histories of other tribal groups and alliances of the Highland, still awaits its author.

Judging from the records of the Urartian kings, during their invasions the constituent principalities ("kingdoms") of Etiuni were repeatedly conquered and destroyed, and the population taken captive. At the end of the 9th century B.C. the Urartian kings Išpuini and Minua mention the "kings of Etiuhi" that fought against Urartu. The successive Urartian kings recount their further invasions and victories over Etiuni. These declarations are unilateral. Only the victories and the conquests of the kings of Urartu are recalled. However, in some cases there appear opposing facts. According to one interpretation of a passage from the annals of Argišti I, during the reign of this powerful king, the Etiunians invaded Urartu and stole the *aštiuzi* of the city of Ardini (to the southeast of Lake Urmia), which is interpreted as "idol, god" and is compared with Arm. *astuac* "god" (Melikishvili 1979; cf. Arutyunyan 2001: 178, 180, n. 44). According to an Assyrian reconnaissance report of the times of Rusa I (ca. 730-710 B.C.),

Twice the Etinaeans have made an uprising against him [i.e. Rusa I—A.P.].
They are causing him military losses. They have plundered him. For a third

¹⁹ In Urartian writing the transcript of /h/ as h is doubtful, see Diakonoff 1958: 42, 52; Khach'ikyan 1985: 41. For the omission of /h/ cf. e.g. the identification of the Urartian toponym Abuni with Arm. Haw(n)uni (Arutyunyan 1985: 9-10).

time they are joining up against him. Ursa [Rusa—A.P.] has come straight from Turuṣpa [the Assyrian name of the capital of Urartu Tuṣpa—A.P.], [and] is going yet again against the Etinaeans.

According to another Assyrian analogous text “Urartu is destroyed” and the “people of Etuna” are mentioned, who, apparently, destroyed the country (Saggs 2001: 117, 147). There is no doubt that these “Etinaeans” and “Etunaeans” (*e-ti-ni-a-a*, *e?-tu?-na-a-a*, the second text is damaged) are the Etiunians, whose appellation is borrowed from Urartian (Grekyan, forthcoming). During this period there was no other country or tribe by this name that could have organized several invasions and destroyed such a powerful kingdom as Urartu. The variation Etina / Etuna also hints at this.

As repeatedly pointed out by Diakonoff and others, the policy of resettling captives carried out by the kings of Van played a significant role in the process of the Armenization of the Armenian Highland. Many captives were taken from Etiuni, who, according to only partially preserved sources, widely outnumbered the captives brought from the West (especially the 6,600 resettlers of Erebuni, not numerous by Urartian standards). According to an inscription, King Minua (810-786 B.C.) took from Etiuni 50 *atibi*, i.e., half a million people (Dinçol 1976: 25-26 [misprint: fifty thousand]; Salvini 1980: 167). It is hard to believe in the authenticity of this number; however, this indicates the enormous scale of confrontation between Etiuni and Urartu (this number of captives would have been enough to make the language of Etiuni dominant over the whole Armenian Highland). Minua's successors also took large numbers of captives from Etiuni. Prior to the downfall of Urartu, Rusa II (c. 685-645 B.C.) recalls Etiuni as one of the enemy / foreign countries (among which are mentioned Assyria, Hatti, Muṣkini, etc), from which he had resettled captives in the Van area (Salvini 2001: 258, 261). Etiuni was once again in conflict with the kingdom of Van. However, Etiuni, despite being frequently attacked by the kings of Van and having suffered heavy losses, was able to resist and, until the downfall of Urartu, maintain its non-Urartian identity.

Ayrarat was the central province of Greater Armenia, its mainstay, its political, religious, and cultural center, and domain of the kings. In the ethnogenic myth, the forefather Hayk settles in the region of Hark', but his eldest son and successor Aramaneak moves to Ayrarat, the Ararat valley, where the creation of Armenia (“the Armenian universe”) took place after Hayk. The neighboring mountains of the Ararat valley (Aragac, Masis, Gelam) are named after the successors of Aramaneak. The whole province and its central plain is called the “plain of Ara” after the last ethnogenic patriarch Ara the Handsome, who perished here. Thus, starting from mythical Aramaneak till now Ayrarat remains the center of Armenia. Almost all of the capital cities of Armenia were located here (Armawir, Erwandaṣat, Artaṣat, Duin, Ani, Erevan, etc).²⁰

²⁰ The toponym Ayrarat and its eponyms Aramaneak and Ara bring to mind the Indo-European **ar(y)o-* and **aryomen-*, which appear as the names of Indo-European tribes, homelands, sacred centers and corresponding eponyms: cf. Indo-Iran. ethnonym **aryo-*; homelands and sacred centers: Ind. *Āryāvarta*, Avest. *Airyana vaējah*, (Pehl. *Ērān* “Iran,” Old Osset. **Alani* “Alans” < **aryana*); theonyms: Hitt. *Āra* (< **ā-ro-*), Ind. *Aryaman*, Iran. *Airyaman*, Irish *Eremon*, Germ. *Irmin*. Note that **aryo-* “friend, master, lord,” would regularly yield Arm. *ayr-*, while *Aramaneak* / *Aramenak* can represent a conflation of **aryomen-* with the name of the ethnogenic patriarch Aram (Petrosyan 2002: 83-87).

In the ethnogenic myth the father of Ara the Handsome, Aram, figures as the conqueror of the southern areas of the Armenian Highland, while his domain was the Ararat valley in the north (i.e. Etiuni). The mythical Aram would inevitably have embraced the reminiscence about the first known historic king of Urartu, Aramu. After Aramu the dynasty and the center of Urartu were changed (Melikishvili 1954: 202; Salvini 1995: 35). Urartu's next known king was Sarduri I, son of Lutipri, whose capital city was Tušpa (Van) to the east of Lake Van.

Šamiram-Semiramis is famous in the myths of many peoples. In Armenian tradition, though represented as the queen of Assyria, she figures as the eponym of Urartu. She is the one who established the city of Van, which has also been called *Šamiramakert* 'built by Šamiram,' and *k'alak Šamiramay*, "city of Šamiram," by the Armenians. Van is attested as Tušpa in Urartian and was the center of the goddess Tušpuea, the wife of the sun god. Hence, Šamiram would have assimilated the figure of Tušpuea. Van-Tušpa was rebuilt and established as the center of Urartu by Sarduri I. Even the construction of the famous irrigation canal of Van, built by King Minua, is ascribed to Šamiram ("Šamiram's canal"). Šamiram perished on the shores of Lake Van (Xorenac'i 1,18; for the legends, see Abeghyan 1966: 70-71). Šamiram was the one who defeated Ara the Handsome and conquered Armenia, Ara's country, i.e. Ayrarat, "plain of Ara" (note that mythological heroes frequently eponymize the territories where they were killed.). The legend recounts the opposition of Assyria and Armenia. However, taking into account the mythological nature of the legend, the area of Van (eponymized by the queen Šamiram) and Ayrarat (eponymized by Ara) can be regarded as the two parties of the conflict. In Urartian terms these would be Biainili ("Urartu," the area of Van) and Etiuni, respectively.

Aramu reigned ca. 860-840 B.C., while Šamiram's historical prototype, Queen Sammuramat, ruled Babylon in 810-806 B.C. Thus, the conflict between Šamiram and Ara may be regarded as the mythological reflection of Etiuni's conquest by the kingdom of Van, which took place during the same period (the end of the 9th century B.C.). Moreover, the domain of Ara, i.e. Armenia of the time of Šamiram, unequivocally coincides with Etiuni.

According to the legend Ara was the seventh Haykid, i.e. Armenian, ruler in Ayrarat. Thus the whole pre-Urartian period of Armenian history is embedded in the legends of these seven generations. After Ara the Armenians fall under the rule of Assyria and were only able to free themselves after many generations, as the result of the latter's downfall (Xorenac'i, I.21). According to the Arab historian Masudi, after Šamiram the Armenians for a long time ruled over the kings of Assyria (Ter-Ghevondyan 1965). In reality, during this period Urartu retained a dominant position in the region. Urartu was forgotten in the folk-memory of the peoples, and the contradiction of these data can be explained, if we accept that Urartu has been identified with Assyria in the subsequent folklore of the northerners (the Armenians) and with Armenia in the folklore of the southerners.

An echo of the Armenian's Etiunian descent seems to have survived in Xorenac'i (I.20; I.32): the Assyrian king Tewtamos sends the Armenian patriarch Zarmayr with an Ethiopian army to aid Troy, where he falls victim to the Hellenic daredevils (Zarmayr seems to be identified with Memnon of the *Iliad*). Why would the Armenian patriarch have become the captain of the Ethiopian army? It is possible that

Urat. *Etio* /et^hio-/ and/or Assy. *etina* /etuna somehow reached the later authors who confounded it with well-known Ethiopia (Petrosyan 1991: 114; Petrosyan 1997: 124).

The other hypotheses do not present ethnic names comparable to their preferred prototypes of the Armenian ethnonym *Hay* in the huge corpus of the Urartian onomastics where even the most minor tribes of the Highland are mentioned. According to this hypothesis, Armenians and their land are identified with a powerful confederation, the second ethno-political unit of the Highland next to the kingdom of Van (Biainili, Urartu), situated exactly in the area which figures as the center of Armenia both in the ethnogonic legends and in history.

This hypothesis can explain the Urartu-Armenia transition in a simple way, as a result of the conflict between the northern and southern ethno-political centers of the Highland. After approximately two centuries of dominion by the south the hegemony passed to the north. The population of these two centers and even the ruling elites could at least partially have belonged to the same ethnic groups. The age-long confrontation of the kings of Van (Biainili) and Etiuni is incomparable with the episodic conflicts between the kings of Van and the land of Urme-Taron, emphasized by G. Sargsyan (and perhaps over the wars of the kings of Van with all of the western lands of the Highland: Arme, Urme, Muškini, Hatti, Šupani, etc.).

This hypothesis would explain the evidence of Xenophon dated from 401 B.C. that one part of the country was called "Western Armenia" (*Anabasis*, 4.4.4). Accordingly, the eastern territories, i.e. former Etiuni and surroundings could have been perceived as the "Essential Armenia" (G. Sargsyan 1988: 61-64).

The authors of the other hypotheses have sought the cradle of Armenia in the south and in the west of the Armenian Highland. There are several subjective and objective reasons for this. The information provided by ancient sources concerns the southern and western regions of the Highland; the ethnogonic legends localize the first Armenian centers to the north of Lake Van or the headstream of the Euphrates; the main cult centers of the Armenian pre-Christian gods were also located in the upper flows of the Euphrates; and according to Greek authors, the Armenians came from the west (Phrygia). All of the serious researchers of recent times—Diakonoff, Djahukian, Ivanov, G. Sargsyan, et al.—have accepted the presence of the Proto-Armenians to the west of the Armenian Highland in pre-Urartian times. For the Etiuni hypothesis too there is no reason to deny the western origin of the Proto-Armenians (this is not an essential condition though). Nevertheless, the search for the Proto-Armenians in the west during the Urartian period implies that they entered the central and northern areas of the Highland during and/or after the existence of the Urartian Empire. While if we accept that the Proto-Armenians already populated the territory of the domain of Hayk and neighboring regions before the Urartian period, then we can also date to pre-Urartian times the Armenization of Ayrarat, presented in the ethnogonic myth as the settlement of the second Armenian eponymous patriarch Aramaneak/ Aranenak in the Ararat valley.

One more argument: of Hayk's three sons it is Aramaneak who leaves his father's domain and resettles in Ayrarat. The two other sons, Xoř and Manawaz, stay in the domain of Hayk and eponymize the districts of Xorxořunik' and Manawazeank'. This needs explanation. The eldest son of the patriarch, second eponym of the people, would have stayed in his father's domain, as it happened in the case of Aramaneak's successors. This discrepancy in the legend's logic can be explained by historical

reasons. Hayk's son Xoř is considered the eponym of the Hurrians (cuneiform *hurri* = *xorə* > Arm. *Xor*, cf. Hebr. *ḥōrī*, Gk. *χορῆος*) (Kapantsyan 1961: 114-115; Djahukian 1981: 55), while Manawaz, being interpreted as an Iranianized form of the Urartian name Minua, can be considered an Urartian eponym (Markwart 1901: 162; Djahukian 1987: 441). The ethnogenic myth dates these events to six generations earlier than the patriarch Aram, who, in historical context, should be identified with the first king of Urartu Aramu (mid-9th century B.C.). Thus, in spite of the methodological problem of the historical reconstruction on the basis of myth, Aramaneak's move from his father's domain may be interpreted as the move of the Proto-Armenians to Etiuni under the pressure of the Hurro-Urartians, occurring before King Aramu's reign. Nevertheless, those movements lack exact chronology (Petrosyan 2002: 179 ff., 187).

To sum up, we can say that according to the logic of the existing data, even if the ethnonym *Hay* is not connected with Etiuni, nevertheless, this country could have been the center of the Armenians as early as pre-Urartian times.

We can point out the following arguments supporting this hypothesis:

- a) The space and time correspondence to the data of the ethnogenic legends, where Ayrarat and the Ararat valley are presented as the center of post-Haykid Armenia;
- b) The identification of the Armenians as one of the most important peoples among the Highland's population in Urartian times, as opposed to other viewpoints, where the Armenians, inexplicably, do not appear in the vast material of the Urartian onomastics;
- c) The simple historical interpretation of the Urartu-Armenia transition, as the change of the predominant center of the Armenian Highland: geographically from south to north, ethnically from the ruling elite of Urartu to the Armenians;
- d) The evident Armenian etymology of at least one king's name (*D/Tiusini*). The other hypotheses localizing the Armenians in the south and west of the Highland, do not identify even one single personal name which could be more or less reliably etymologized in Armenian.

The weak points are:

- a) The form *Etiu* instead of *Atiu*;
- b) The obscurity of the chronology of the transition **t (t') > y* in Armenian;
- c) The presence of probable non-Armenian names in Etiuni, etc.

The Subjective Factors

Abstaining from a final conclusion let us state that these three hypotheses are presently circulating in scientific studies. All three are indeed hypothetical, resulting from the deficiency of data and the possibility of alternative interpretations. The hypotheses in whole are not necessarily alternative and, at least on some points, can be reconciled. Nevertheless, this is only a theoretical possibility and for the present time they should be considered as independent.

In the spreading and estimation of these hypotheses the role of personalities has been significant. Diakonoff, the author of the monograph on the prehistory of the

Armenian people, was a world-famous orientalist, who presented and supported his hypothesis in numerous works, published in Armenian, Russian, and European languages. His monograph was translated into English and become the only guide for Western specialists in the study of the Armenian ethnogenesis and prehistory. Thus, Diakonoff's theory, even though it has never been supported in whole by other competent scholars, is widely referenced in various scientific works of the world.

The Hayasa hypothesis has been criticized for its proponent Kapantsyan's unacceptable linguistic approaches. In later (post-Kapantsyan) versions, it is in fact the only hypothesis widely accepted by competent scholars. As concerns the Etiuni hypothesis, it has not been discussed widely.²¹

Diakonoff and the adherents of the Hayasa hypothesis have analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the two theories and have criticized and considered unlikely the one negated by them (Diakonoff 1968: 209-213; Diakonoff 1983a: 158; Diakonoff 1984: 106 ff.; Bănăteanu 1961: 107-110; Djahukian 1961: 387-388; Djahukian 1987: 281-283; Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1984: 913) (note that Western readers are well-informed about Diakonoff's ideas and his criticism of the Hayasa theory, while Diakonoff is criticized mostly in Armenian and Russian publications). Sometimes the criticism has been categorical and rude.²²

Armenology, like the other branches of Oriental Studies, is politicized. Colossal means and energy are spent on supporting viewpoints and pursuing political objectives rather than on unbiased discussion of scientific problems and revealing historical truth.

Most of historical Armenia presently constitutes a part of Turkey (renamed "Eastern Anatolia"), which conducts a policy of minimizing the role of the Armenians in history. The terms Armenia and Armenian are almost excluded from the lexicon of some studies on the ancient history of the Armenian Highland. In these works the hypothesis of the Balkanic origin of the Armenians is widely accepted. This theory attracts authors by the supposition that the (Proto-) Armenians were a small group of Balkanic migrants. It is Diakonoff's monograph that is frequently referenced, although the various theses argued in the monograph and in other works of the author, which are considered "pro-Armenian," are not taken into consideration (e.g. that the Proto-Armenians inhabited the west of the Armenian Highland before the formation of Urartu; that there are Armenian borrowings in Urartian; that Armenians are the genetic and cultural successors of the ancient population of Urartu and the pre-Urartian states of the Armenian Highland; and that the history of the Armenian people should not begin from the post-Urartian period but should also include the period of Urartu and pre-Urartian states, etc).

²¹ In some of his works H. Karagyozyan tried to maintain this hypothesis, but on the grounds of unacceptable arguments, see G. Sargsyan 1988: 169; Petrosyan 1991a.

²² According to Ivanov (1983: 30, n. 31), new discoveries, particularly pertaining to the toponym and ethnonym *Haya* and its relation with *Armi* and *Azi*, "corroborate the correctness of G.A. Kapantsyan's conclusions on the Hayasan origin of the Armenians and the absolute fallacy of all of the constructs of I.M. Diakonoff on the origin of the ethnonym *Hay* < **hati* and other problems of Armenian ethnogenesis." In return, in the English version of his monograph, Diakonoff calls the Hayasa theory "fallacious" and "unacceptable;" in another work, written with a co-author, we read: "Barrels of ink have been spilled in attempts to prove that the Hayasans were the ancestors of the *Hayk* (Armenians): a severe case of the malady called 'Sirene des Gleichklangs'" (Diakonoff 1984: 182, n. 24, 201, n. 120; Diakonoff and Medvedskaya 1987: 386).

On the other hand, there are pseudo-scientific ethnocentric “theories” circulating in Armenia. Today in the West studies on nationalism have become fashionable. These theories are the focus of attention and are considered in the context of the development of nationalism in Armenia. Some devotees of Diakonoff in the West consider the other scientific hypotheses as nationalist or even anti-scientific, invented and accepted only in Armenia. Were it not for these factors we would be closer to the solution of many questions *at issue*.

INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ETHNOGRAPHY
YEREVAN, ARMENIA

REFERENCES

- Abeghyan, M. 1966. *Erker* (Works). Vol. 1. Erevan: Haykakan SSH GA Hratarakch'ut'yun.
- Adontz, N. 1927. "Tarkou chez les anciens arméniens." *Revue des études arméniennes* 1.
- _____. 1946. *Histoire d'Arménie*. Paris.
- Acharyan, H. 1901. "Hayoc' cagume ew naxapatmakan shrjane" (Origins of the Armenians and Pre-historic Period). *Vtak*. Tiflis.
- _____. 2004. *Hayoc' patmut 'yun miahyusvac endhanur patmut 'yan het* (History of Armenia Intertwined with General History). Erevan.
- Agathangelos. 1976. *History of the Armenians*. Trans. R.W. Thomson. Albany, New York.
- Ahyan, S. 1982. "Les débuts de l'histoire d'Arménie et les trois fonctions indo-européennes." *Revue de l'histoire des religion*, CIC-3.
- Alishan, Gh. 1895. *Hin havatk' kam het' anosakan kronk' hayoc'* (Old Beliefs or the Heathen Religion of the Armenians). Venice.
- Allen, R.H. 1963. *Star Names: Their Lore and Meaning*. New York.
- Anonym. 1978. "The 'Primary history.'" In: Khorenats'i.
- Arutyunyan, N.V. 1970. *Biainili (Urartu)*. Erevan.
- _____. 1985. *Toponimika Urartu*. Erevan.
- _____. 2001. *Korpus urartskix klinoobraznyx nadpisej*. Erevan.
- Avetisyan, P.S. 2004. "Kensatarack'i kazmakerpman karuc'vacke ev soc'ial-zhoghovrdakan gorcent'ac'nere Hayastanum K'.A. XXII-IX dd." (The Structure of the Organization of Living Space and the Social-Demographic processes in Armenia in the 22th-9th Centuries B.C.). *Hayastani patmakan zhoghavrdagrut'yan himnaharc'er*. Erevan.
- Barseghyan, L. 1996. *Hay zhoghovrdi cagman ev kazmavorman harc'ere patmagitut 'yan mej* (The Problems of the Origin and Formation of the Armenian People in Historical Studies). Erevan.
- Bănăteanu, V. 1961. "Nekotorye voprosy etnogeneza armjan." *Patma-banasirakan handes* 2.

- Brixhe, C. 2004. "Phrygian." *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge.
- Burney, Charles and David Marshall Lang. 1971. *The Peoples of the Hills: Ancient Ararat and Caucasus*. New York: Praeger; London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Çilingiroğlu, A. and M. Salvini. 2001. "The Historical Background of Ayanis." *Ayanis I. Ten Years Excavations at Rusahinili Eiduri-kai*. Rome.
- Clackson, J. 1994. *The Linguistic Relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford.
- Diakonoff, I.M. 1956. "Xet'ere p'ryugac'inere, hayere" (Hittites, Phrygians, and Armenians). *HSSR GA Teghekagir* 11.
- _____. 1958. "Materialy k fonetike urart'skogo jazyka." *Woprosy grammatiki i istorii vostochnyx jazykov*. Moscow, Leningrad.
- _____. 1967. *Jazyki drevnej Perednej Azii*. Moscow.
- _____. 1968. *Predystorija armjanskogo naroda*. Erevan.
- _____. 1976. "Mesto frigijskogo sredi indoevropskix jazykov." *Drevnij Vostok* 2.
- _____. 1981. "600 g. do n.e. i poxody vavilonskix carej." *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 2.
- _____. 1983. "Tipy etnicheskix peredvizhenij v rannej drevnosti." *Drevnij Vostok* 4.
- _____. 1983a. "K praistorii armjanskogo jazyka." *Patma-banasirakan handes* 4.
- _____. 1984. *The Pre-History of the Armenian People*. Trans. Lori Jennings. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.
- _____. 1985. "Hurro-Urartian Borrowings in Old Armenian." *Journal of the the American Oriental Society* 4, no 105.
- _____. 1992. "First Evidence of the Proto-Armenian Language in Eastern Anatolia." *Annual of Armenian Linguistics*, 13.
- _____. 2005. "O samonazvanii armjanskogo naroda." *Patma-banasirakan handes* 2.

- Diakonoff, I.M. and I.N. Medvedskaya. 1987. "The Kingdom of Urartu." Review of: *Das Reich Urartu: Ein altorientalischer Staat im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Xenia* 17, Konstanz. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. XLIV 3/4.
- Diakonoff, I.M. and V.P. Neroznak. 1985. *Phrygian*. Delmar, New York.
- Dinçol, A.M. 1976. "Die neuen urartäischen Inschriften aus Kōrzūt." *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 26.
- Djahukian, G.B. 1961. "The Hayasa Language and its Relation to the Indo-European Languages." *Archiv Orientalni* 29/3.
- _____. 1964. *Xajasskij jazyk i yego otnoshenie k indoevropskim jazykam*. Erevan.
- _____. 1967. *Ocherki po istorii dopis'mennogo perioda armjanskogo jazyka*. Erevan.
- _____. 1970. *Hayerene ev hin hndevropakan lezunere* (Armenian and Ancient Indo-European Languages). Erevan.
- _____. 1981. "Movses Xorenac'u 'Hayoc patmutyan' arajin grk'i andznanneri lezvakan aghbyurnere" (The Linguistic Sources of the Personal Names of the First Book of Movses Xorenac'i's "History of Armenia." *Patma-banasirakan handes* 3.
- _____. 1986. "Haykakan sherte urartakan dic'aranum" (Armenian Layan in the Urartian Pantheon). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 1.
- _____. 1987. *Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun: naxagrayin zhamanakashrjan* (History of Armenian language: Pre-Literal Period). Erevan.
- _____. 1988. "Urarterene ev hayerene" (Urartian and Armenian languages). *Urartu-Armenia*. Erevan.
- _____. 1988. "aO sootnoshenii xajasskogo i armjanskogo jazykov." *Patma-banasirakan handes* 1, 2.
- _____. 1990. "Did Armenians Live in Asia Anterior Before the Twelfth Century B.C.?" In *When Worlds Collide: Indo-Europeans and the Pre-Indo-Europeans*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers.
- _____. 1992. "Armenian Words and Proper Names in Urartian Inscriptions." In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Armenian Linguistics*. Ed. John A.C. Greppin. Delmar, NY: Caravan Books.

- _____. 1992a. *Zruyc'ner hayoc' lezvi masin* (Discourse on Armenian language). Erevan.
- _____. 1992b. "Nor tvyalner hayoc' naxak'ristoneakan kroni masin" (New Data on the Armenian Pre-Christian Religion). *Patma-Banasirakan handes* 1.
- Drews, R., ed. 2001. *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family. Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph* 38. Washington D.C.
- Dumézil, G. 1994. *Le roman des jumeaux et autres essais*. Paris.
- Eremyan, S.T. 1958. "Hayeri c'eghayin miut'yune Arme-Shubria erkrum" (The Tribal Union of the Armenians in the Land of Arme-Shubria). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 3.
- _____. 1963. "Hayastane est Ašxarhac'oyc'i" (Armenia According to the Ašxarhac'oyc'). Erevan.
- Fontenrose, J. 1981. *Orion: The Myth of the Hunter and the Huntress*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.
- Forrer, E. 1931. "Hajasa-Azzi." *Caucasica*. Fasc. 9.
- Gamkrelidze, T.V. and Viach. Vs. Ivanov. 1984. *Indoevropskii iazyk i indoevropsy: Rekonstruktsiia i istoriko-tipologicheskii analiz praiazyka i protokul'tury*. Tbilisi: Izdatelstvo Tbilisskogo Universiteta.
- Gelb, I. 1944. *Hurrians and Subarians*. Chicago.
- Georgiev, V.I. 1958. *Issledovaniia po sravnitel'no-istoricheskomu iazykoznaniiu: Rodstvennye otnosheniia indoevropskikh iazykov*. Moscow.
- _____. 1960. "Peredvizhenie smychnykh soglasnykh v armianskom iazyke i voprosy etnogeneza armjan." *Voprosy iazykoznanii* 5.
- Gindin, L.A. 1981. *Drevneishaia onomastika vostochnykh Balkan: Frako-khetto-luviiskie i frako-maloaziiskie izoglossy*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo Bolgarskoi Akademii Nauk.
- _____. 1993. *Naselenie gomerovskoi Troi: Istoriko-filologicheskie issledovaniia po etnologii drevnei Anatolii*. Moscow: "Nauka."
- Grayson, A.K. 1976. *Assyrian Royal Inscriptions*. Vol. II, part 2, Wiesbaden.
- Grekyan, Y. Forth. *Blainili-Urartu*.

- Greppin, J. 1984. "Early Greek Historical Fragments Pertinent to Armenian Matters." *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 1.
- _____. 1995. "Kurilovicz and Hittite h, and Further Extensions on to Armenian." *Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracovensia. Vol. II: Kurilowicz Memorial Volume*. Part 1. Cracow.
- Haas, V. 1986. "Die ältesten Nachrichten zur Geschichte des armenischen Hochlands." *Das Reich Urartu: Ein altorientalischer Staat im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Xenia*, 17, Konstanz.
- Hawkins, J.D. 1957-71. "Hatti." *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archaeologie* III.
- Ivanov, V.V. 1983. "Vydelenie raznyx xronologicheskix sloev v drenearmjanskom i problema pervonachal'noj struktury teksta gimna Va(x)agnu." *Patma-bana-sirakan handes* 4.
- Jensen, P. 1898. *Hittiter und Armenier*. Strassburg: K.J. Trübner.
- Kapantsian, Gr. 1931-33. *Chetto-Armeniaca: Sravnitel'no-lingvisticheskoe issledovanie, vyivliaiushchee do 200 obshshikh slov i form*. Erevan: Gosizdat SSRA.
- _____. 1947. *Khaiasa—kolybel' armian: Etnogenez armian i ikh nachal'naia istoriia*. Erevan: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk Armianskoi SSR.
- Kapantsyan, G.A. 1961. *Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun: hin shrjan* (History of Armenian Language: Early Period). Erevan.
- Khach'atryan, Ast. 1933. *Hayastani sepagrakan shrjani k'nnakan patmut'yun* (History of Armenia in the Cuneiform Period). Erevan: Hratarakut'yun Melk'onian Fondi.
- Khach'atryan, H. 2003. "Amusin haskac'ut'yan baranvanumnere hayereni barbarerum" (The Words for the Concept "Husband" in Armenian Dialects). *Gitu t'yun ev texnika* 1.
- Khachikyan, M.L. 1985. *Xurritskij i urartskij jazyki*. Erevan.
- Khazaradze, N. 2002. "The "Western Muski" in Central Anatolia." *Orientalia. Istorija i jazyki Drevnego Vostoka: pamjati I.M. Diakonova*. St. Petersburg.
- Khorenats'i, Movsēs. 1978. *History of the Armenians*. Trans. R.W. Thomson. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

- Kortlandt, F. 2003. *Armeniaca. Comparative Notes by Frederik Kortlandt with an Appendix on the Historical Phonology of Classical Armenian by R. Beekes*. Oxford.
- Kosyan, A.V. 1994. *Luvijskie carstvaMnaloj Azii i prilagajushchih oblastej v XII-VIII vv. Do n.e. (po ieroglificheskim luvijskim istochnikam)*. Erevan.
- _____. 1997. "The Mushki Problem Reconsidered." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* XXXIX/2.
- _____. 1998. *Tun Torgomay* (House of Torgom). Erevan.
- _____. 1999. "Aram nahapete Kapadovkiayum" (The Patriarch Aram in Cappadocia). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 1.
- _____. 1999a. *M.t'.a. 12-rd dari merjavorarevelyan chgnazhame yev haykakan lernashxarhe* (The Near-Eastern Crisis of the 12th Century B.C. and the Armenian Highland). Erevan.
- _____. 2002. "Luvijcy, frigijcy, mushki." *Orientalia. Istorija i jazyki Drevnego Vostoka: pamjati I.M. Diakonova*. St. Petersburg.
- _____. 2004. *Haykakan lernashxarhi teghanunnere (est xet'akan aghbyurneri)* (Toponyms of Armenian Highland [According to Hittite Sources]). Erevan.
- _____. 2005. "Hayasayi astvacnere (KUB XVI 39)" (The Gods of Hayasa [KUB XVI 39]). *Merdzavor ev mijin arevelk'i yerkrner ev zhoghovurdner* XXIV. Erevan.
- Krahe, H. 1962. *Die Struktur der alteuropäischen Hydronymie*. Wiesbaden.
- Kretschmer, P. 1932. "Der nationale Name der Armenier Haikh." *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 69.
- Laroche, E. 1985. "Toponymes hittites ou pre-hittites dans la Turquie moderne." *Hethitica* 6.
- Loon, M.N. van. 1966. *Urartian Art*. Istanbul.
- _____. 1987. "Rreview of: I.M. Diakonoff. *The Prehistory of the Armenian People*." *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. XLIV 3/4.
- Mallory, J.P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans. Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London.

- Mallory, J.P. and D.Q. Adams. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*. London, Chicago.
- Manandyan, Hakob. 1944. *K'nnakan tesut 'yun hay zhoghovrdi patmut 'yan* (Critical Outline of Armenian History). Vol. 1. Erevan: Haypethrat.
- _____. 1956. "Soobshchenija xettskix, assirijskix, urartijskix i drevnermjansjix istochnikov o Xajase-Azzi." *O nekotoryx spornyx problemax istorii i geografii drevnej Armenii*. Erevan.
- Markwart, J. 1901. *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac 'i*. Berlin.
- _____. 1919. *Die Entstehung und Wiederstellung der armenischer Nation*. Berlin.
- _____. 1928. "Le berceau des arméniens." *Revue des études arméniennes* 8, f. 2.
- Matiossian, V. 1991. "Hayoc' cagumi harc'er" (Problems of Armenian Origins). *Handes Amsorya*.
- Martirosean, N.A. 1924. "Hayer ēni haraberut'iwnē het'iterēni het" (Relation of Armenian with Hittite). *Handes Amsorya* XXXVIII, 9-10: 458-459.
- Melikishvili, G.A. 1954. *Nairi-Urartu*. Tbilisi: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk Gruzinskoi SSR.
- _____. 1958. "K voprosu o xetto-cupanijskix pereselencax v Urartu." *Vestnik drevnej istorii* 2.
- _____. 1960. *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi*. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- _____. 1962. "Kulxa." *Drevnij mir*. Moscow.
- _____. 1979. "K chteniju odnogo mesta v letopisi urartskogo carja Argishti I." *Peredneaziatskij zhornik*. Moscow.
- _____. 1989. "Obrazovanie kartlijskogo (iberijskogo) gosudarstva." *Očerki istorii Gruzii*. Vol. 1. Tbilisi.
- Mellink, M.Y. 1965. "Mita, Mushki and Phrygians." *Anadolu Araştırmaları*, 2.
- Monte, G. del and J. Tischler. 1978. *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Répertoire géographique des textes cuneiforms* 6. Wiesbaden.

- Movsisyan, A.E. 2000. *Srbazan lernashkharhē* (The Sacred Highland). Erevan: HH GAA "Gitut'yun" Hratarakch'ut'yun.
- Mroveli, L. 1979. *Zhizn' kartlijskix carej*. Trans. G. Tsulaya. Moscow.
- Neroznak, V.P. 1976. "K izucheniju frigijskogo jazyka: problemy i rezul'taty." *Drevnij Vostok* 2.
- Patkanov, K.P. 1881. "Vanskie nadpisi i zanachenie ix dlja istorii Perednej Azii." *Zhurnal ministerstva narodnogo prosveshchenija*. St. Petersburg.
- Petrosyan, A.Y. 1984. "Naxahayereni kroghneri teghaynac'man harc'i shurje" (On the Localization of the Speakers of Proto-Armenian). *Eritasard lezvabanneri 4-rd konferans*. Erevan.
- _____. 1986. "Hay ceghanune vorpes hanrutyany hasarakakan karucvacki termin" (The Ethnonym Hay as a Term of the Social Structure of Society). *Eritasard lezvabanneri hanrapetakan higerord gitazhoghovi nyut'er*. Erevan.
- _____. 1991. "Armjanskije etnonimy, drevnearmjanskaja model' mira i vopros lokalizacii drevnejshix armjanskix plemjon." *Banber Erevani hamalsarani* 2.
- _____. 1991a. "Samonazvanie armian i vopros lokalizacii protoarmjanskix plemen." *Lraber hasarakakan gitut'yunneri* 5.
- _____. 1997. *Arami araspele hndevropakan hamatek'stum yev yev hayoc' azgacagman xndire* (The Myth of Aram in the Context of Indo-European Mythology and the Problem of Armenian Ethnogenesis). Erevan.
- _____. 2002. "The Indo-European and Ancient Near Eastern Sources of the Armenian Epic." *Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph* 42. Washington D.C.
- _____. 2003. "Hayoc' azgacagman harc'er avandakan tvylalneri k'nnutyany luysitak" (Problems of Armenian Ethnogenesis in the Light of the Traditional Data). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 2.
- _____. 2006. *Hayoc' azgacagman harc'er* (Problems of Armenian Ethnogenesis). Erevan.
- Petrova, E. 1998. "Bryges and Phrygians: Parallelism between the Balkans and Asia Minor through Archaeological, Linguistic and Historical Evidence." *Thracians and Phrygians: Problems of Parallelism*. Ankara.
- Piotrovskii, B.B. 1945. "Hay zhoghovrdi cagman harc'i shurj" (On the Origin of the Armenian People). *HSSR GA Teghegagir* 6.

- _____. 1946. *O proisxozhdenii armianskogo naroda*. Erevan.
- _____. 1959. *Vanskoe carstvo*. Erevan.
- Renfrew, C. 1987. *Archaeology and Language. The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*. London.
- Roth, Karl. 1927. "Die Bedeutung des Armenischen." *Handes Amsorya* XLI, 11-12: 751-748.
- Saggs, H. 2001. *The Nimrud Letters. Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud*, V. London.
- Salvini, M. 1980. "Un testo celebrativo di Menua." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* XXII.
- _____. 1987. "La formation de l'état urartéen." *Hethitica* 8.
- _____. 1995. *Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer*. Darmstadt.
- _____. 2001. "The Inscriptions of Ayanis (Rusahinili Eiduri-kai)." *Ayanis I. Ten Years Excavations at Rusahinili Eiduri-kai*. Rome.
- _____. 2001a. "About a New Corpus of Urartian Inscriptions." *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* LXXIII/2.
- Sargsyan, G.Kh. 1988. "Urartakan terut'yune ev hayere" (The Urartian Empire and the Armenians). *Urartu-Armenia*.
- _____. 1992. "Xorenats'u 'Hayoc' patmut'yune' ev sepagrakan aghbyurnere (The "History of Armenia" of Khorenats'i and Cuneiform Sources). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 2-3.
- Sargsyan, D. 1991. "Urartac'iner, alarodner, armenner harc'i masin" (On the problem of the Armenians, Alarodians, and Urartians). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 1.
- Sevin, V. 1991. "The Early Iron Age in the Elazig Region and the Problem of the Mushkians." *Anatolian Studies*, XLI.
- Struve, V.V. 1946. "Novye dannye istorii Armenii zaswidetel'stwowannye bexistunskoj nadpis'ju." *HSSR GA Teghegagir* 8.
- Tashean, H. 1920. *Usumn dasakan hayer en lezvi* (Study of Classical Armenian). Vienna: Mkhitaran Tparan.
- _____. 1934. *Hat'er ew Urartean* (Hittites and Urartians). Vienna: Mkhitaran Tparan.

- Ter-Ghevondyan, A. 1965. "Ara ev Shamiram" araspeli mi ardzagank'e arab patmich Masudu mot" (An Echo of the myth of "Ara and Shamiram" in the Arab Historian Masudi). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 4.
- _____. 1971. "Hayeri cagman zruyci arabakan tarberake" (The Arab Version of the Legend on Armenian Origin). *Banber Erevani hamalsarani* 1.
- Tiratsyan, N.G. 2006. "Ivarsha ev Marduk astvacneri pashtamunk'e Araratyan dashtum" (The gods Ivarsha and Marduk in Ararat Valley). *Patma-banasirakan handes* 2.
- Tjomkin, E.N. and V.G. Erman. 1985. *Mify drevnej Indii*. Moscow.
- Toumanoff, Cyril. 1963. *Studies in Christian Caucasian History*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press
- Trubachev, O.N. 2003. *Etnogenez i kul'tura drevneishikh slavian: lingvisticheskie issledovaniia*. Moscow: "Nauka."
- Zimansky, P. 1995. "Uartian Material Culture as State Assemblage: An Anomaly in the Archaeology of Empire." *Bulletin of American School of Research*, 299-300.
- _____. 2001. "Archaeological Inquiries into Ethno-Linguistic Diversity in Urartu." *Greater Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family*. Washington D.C.
- Zimansky, P. and E.C. Stone. 2003. "Recent Excavations at Uartian Fortress of Ayanis." *Archaeology in the Borderlands. Investigations in Caucasia and Beyond*. Los Angeles.